



Deaf-Mute Education in Massachusetts.

R E P O R T

OF THE

JOINT SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE
LEGISLATURE OF 1867,

ON THE

EDUCATION OF DEAF-MUTES:

WITH

AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

EVIDENCE, ARGUMENTS, LETTERS, ETC.,
SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE.

BOSTON, MASS., JUNE, 1867.

WRIGHT & POTTER, STATE PRINTERS,
No. 4 SPRING LANE.
1867.

INDEX

TO THE REPORT AND APPENDIX.

[The Report is paged from 1 to 22; the Appendix from 1 to 236. Topics in the Report are indicated by *Italics*; in the Appendix they stand in Roman.]

	Page.
<i>Preliminary</i> ,	1-3
<i>Muteness a Calamity</i> ,	3-4
<i>The American Asylum</i> ,	4-5
<i>Massachusetts Pupils</i> ,	6
<i>Management of the Asylum</i> ,	7
<i>Board of Government</i> ,	7-9
<i>Wards</i> ,	9-10
<i>A Longer Term</i> ,	10
<i>Additional Appropriation</i> ,	11
<i>Miss Rogers' School</i> ,	11-12
<i>Purposes and Opinions</i> ,	12-14
<i>Expatriation</i> ,	14
<i>Earlier Education</i> ,	14-15
<i>Summary</i> ,	15-17
<i>Conclusions</i> ,	17-18
<i>Act of Incorporation</i> ,	19-20
<i>Bill concerning Deaf-Mute Education</i> ,	21-22

APPENDIX.

FIRST HEARING,	2-25
Remarks of Dr. S. G. Howe,	2-5, 11-13, 24
of F. B. Sanborn,	6, 9, 14, 15, 20-24
of Gardiner G. Hubbard,	6-11
of Hon. Thomas Talbot,	13-14
of George Homer,	14-15
of Amos Smith,	15-18
of W. K. Chase,	18-20
Case of Francis Green,	22-23
of Mr. Chamberlain,	24-25
SECOND HEARING,	26-70
Remarks of Dr. S. G. Howe,	26-36, 40-42, 48
Letter of Jonathan Whipple,	31
Remarks of F. B. Sanborn,	36, 39, 40, 42, 48, 51-57
of George Homer,	36-37
of John Carlin,	37-39
of Amos Smith,	40
of Henry W. Muzzey,	43-45

	Page.
Examination of Mabel Hubbard,	44-45
of Miss H. B. Rogers,	45-51
of Rev. Thomas Wilson,	56-57
Remarks of Rev. Collins Stone,	57-70
THIRD HEARING,	71-109
Remarks of Rev. Collins Stone,	71-97
Interpellations of F. B. Sanborn,	79, 92-97
Remarks of Rev. W. W. Turner,	97-109
FOURTH HEARING,	110-144
Remarks of Rev. W. W. Turner,	110-136
Case of Jonathan Whipple,	122-128
Interpellations of G. G. Hubbard,	134
Remarks of Calvin Day,	136-144
FIFTH HEARING,	145-175
Remarks of Calvin Day,	145-149
of Hiram A. Stevens,	149-165
Examination of Rev. Collins Stone in regard to Articulation at Hartford,	165-170
Statement of Mr. Turner on that subject,	170-175
SIXTH HEARING,	176-221
Remarks of Dr. S. G. Howe,	176-188
Interpellations of Mr. Stone,	176-179
Remarks of G. G. Hubbard,	188-207
of F. B. Sanborn,	208-221
Deaf-Mute Resolutions,	208
Paper by Amos Smith,	209, 211
LETTERS,	222-236
Letter from Jonathan Whipple upon teaching Articulation and Lip-Reading,	222-228
Letter from Dr. H. P. Peet,	228-229
from Mrs. M. A. Lippitt,	229-230
from Mrs. Horace Mann,	230-232
from Rev. William Harlow,	232-233
from Prof. Edwards A. Park,	233-234
from Mr. Talbot,	235
Origin and Progress of American Asylum,	235-236
Deaf-Mutes in Massachusetts,	236

SENATE....No. 265.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

IN SENATE, May 27, 1867.

The Joint Special Committee on the Education of Deaf-Mutes, to whom was referred so much of the Governor's Address as relates to that subject; also, the following Petitions of sundry deaf-mutes of Massachusetts, "that the suggestions of His Excellency may be carried out," viz.: of William K. Chase and fifteen others; George Homer and forty-nine others; Laura A. Hayward and nine others; Wilson Derby and eighteen others, and Ellen Green and twenty-two others. Also, the Petitions of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph E. Soper and thirteen others, parents of deaf-mutes, and of Charles F. Green and 372 others, citizens of Worcester, and of Isaac Jennison and fifty-nine others, legal voters of Natick, in aid of the same, have given the matter due consideration, and beg leave to

R E P O R T:

His Excellency says:—

"For successive years the deaf-mutes of the Commonwealth, through annual appropriations, have been placed for instruction and training in the asylum at Hartford. While, in the treatment of these unfortunates, science was at fault and methods were crude, in the absence of local

provisions, this course, perhaps, was justifiable; but with the added light of study and experience, which have explored the hidden ways and developed the mysterious laws by which the recesses of nature are reached, I cannot longer concur in this policy of expatriation. For I confess that I share the sympathetic yearnings of the people of Massachusetts towards these children of the State, detained by indissoluble chains in the domain of silence. This rigid grasp we may never relax; but over unseen wires, through the seemingly impassable gulf that separates them from their fellows, we may impart no small amount of abstract knowledge and moral culture. They are wards of the State. Then, as ours is the responsibility, be ours also the grateful labor. And I know not to what supervision we may more safely intrust this delicate and intricate task, than to the matured experience which has overcome the greater difficulty of blindness superadded to privation of speech and hearing. To no other object of philanthropy will the warm heart of Massachusetts respond more promptly. Assured as I am, on substantial grounds, that legislative action in this direction will develop rich sources of private beneficence, I have the honor to recommend that the initial steps be taken to provide for this class of dependents within our own Commonwealth. Should this policy be adopted, I have every reason to believe that it would eventually result in a permanent decrease of the present annual expenditure for their support."

Your Committee gave long and numerous hearings to the parties interested, as will appear by the phonographic Report of the evidence hereto appended.

In support of the governor's recommendation there appeared Dr. Samuel G. Howe, chairman, and F. B. Sanborn, Esq., secretary of the board of state charities, Gardiner G. Hubbard, Esq., and a large number of deaf-mutes, ladies and gentlemen, with Prof. D. E. Bartlett as interpreter.

To represent the interests of the "American Asylum" were Rev. Collins Stone, principal, W. W. Turner, Esq., former principal, and Calvin Day, Esq., vice-president, and in opposition to the governor's suggestion, Hon. H. A. Stevens of Boston.

It will be noticed that His Excellency touches only the "policy of expatriation," and your Committee might have limited their inquiries to that point. But they allowed a wider range, and most of their time was occupied by an investigation of systems rather than by the question of the location

of institutions. The advocates of a change in the policy of the State, sustained the German system of teaching by "articulation" and "reading from the lips," while the representatives of the Hartford Asylum adhered to the French system of "manual signs" and "finger language."

The word "removal" was frequently used in the earlier hearings, which led to a misapprehension on the part of some, as to the purposes of the governor and the board of state charities. But the latter disclaimed entirely the idea of disturbing existing relations with the Asylum, so far as present pupils are concerned, but they desired that steps be taken to commence the instruction of future applicants within the State.

In addition to the local considerations in favor of this, were, first, the alleged necessity of instruction at an earlier age than pupils are now received at Hartford; and second, the superior advantages of the German over the French system.

The testimony annexed will show the radical difference of opinion in regard to the two systems, entertained by those, throughout the world, who are most versed in the instruction of mutes; and the controversy has been going on between them more or less for two centuries. The large attendance at the hearings, and the comments of the press in and out of the State, exhibited an unexpected public interest in the question.

Most of your Committee entered upon the investigation almost entirely unacquainted with the methods of deaf-mute education, and therefore comparatively free from predilections.

Commending to the legislature careful attention to the evidence annexed, it does not seem needful that your Committee make an extended argument upon methods or become partisans of either, but rather that they submit their conclusions, first making suggestions bearing upon the subjects directly committed to them.

MUTENESS A CALAMITY.

Mr. Turner, in his address to the Committee, eloquently said :

"Whatever may be the difference of views among those who advocate these different modes of instruction, we all admit that deafness and dumbness are very great calamities. For a child to come into the world deprived of the power of hearing, unable to listen to the tones of

a mother's kindness and affection, to the encouraging voice of a father's approbation, unable to engage in the shouts of pleasure that issue from brothers and sisters and playmates, to be shut out from the universal music and voice of nature, to be deaf to the charms of harmony and melody, and to be deprived of all the ordinary modes of social intercourse, of the means of intelligence in regard to passing events, and of everything of interest to a cultivated mind, is indeed a great calamity."

Your Committee are in full sympathy, intensified by their investigation, with those who are suffering from this calamity, and are glad to seek, with any man or set of men, the best means of relieving them.

But they will first consider the past and present relations of Massachusetts to her deaf-mutes.

THE AMERICAN ASYLUM.

The "American Asylum at Hartford for the Education of Deaf-Mutes," is the oldest institution of the kind in the United States. It appears that it was incorporated in May, 1816, by the legislature of Connecticut, by the following Act: "An Act to incorporate the Connecticut Asylum for the Education and Instruction of Deaf and Dumb Persons."

About sixty persons, male and female, were made "a body politic by the name," (as above,) "and by that name they and their successors shall and may have perpetual succession," &c., &c. "Said asylum may from time to time elect additional members, and may make by-laws respecting the number, qualifications and duties of their officers, the mode of election and admission of members," &c., &c.

In May, 1819, by a Resolve of the Connecticut legislature, the name was changed to the "American Asylum," &c.

To establish the institution, it appears that about twelve thousand dollars, (\$12,000,) was raised by subscription, of which fifty-six hundred, (\$5,600,) was obtained in Massachusetts.

March 3, 1819, Congress made a grant of land to the institution, as appears by the following Act:—

"CHAP. 56. An Act in behalf of the Connecticut Asylum, &c.

"*Be it enacted, &c.* That there be granted to the Connecticut Asylum for the education and instruction of deaf and dumb persons, a township

of land, or a tract of land equal thereto, to be located under the direction of the secretary of the treasury, in tracts of not less than four entire sections each, in any of the unlocated lands of the United States to which the Indian title has been extinguished, which land shall be and forever remain to the use of said asylum for the education and instruction of deaf and dumb persons; or if said asylum shall sell said land, which they are authorized to do, the money arising from such sale shall be and remain forever to the same use."

This land realized \$314,000, of which \$75,000 was invested in real estate, the balance in productive funds. The directors voted to expend all and only the income of said funds in deaf-mute education, the principal to remain a sacred trust. The fund has been so managed and remains intact; but by the increase of the value of the real estate, the property of the institution is now estimated at \$500,000.

This income has enabled the directors to reduce the price of tuition and board to about one-half the actual cost.

The rates from 1817 to 1821 were, per annum, .	. \$200 00
1822 to 1825 " "	. 150 00
1826 to 1834 " "	. 115 00
1835 to 1863 " "	. 100 00
for 1864 were 125 00
from 1865 to 1866 were, per annum, .	. 175 00
with the cost of clothing and school-books in addition.	

Average number of pupils for the first forty years, .	125
For the last ten years,	225
Present number,	220
Whole number since 1817,	1,700

Although the institution was undoubtedly founded for the relief of the deaf and dumb, wherever situate, and although the grant of land by Congress was unlimited in this respect, yet as the original subscriptions and the original managers were exclusively from New England, it has always been considered a New England institution.

MASSACHUSETTS PUPILS AT THE ASYLUM.

From sundry Resolves and other public documents,* the following information is obtained :—

May 19, 1819, the legislature of Massachusetts passed a Resolve “authorizing the governor to expend \$4,000 per year, for not exceeding four years, for the support at the American Asylum of twenty deaf and dumb pupils, whom, on information of selectmen of towns, he found needing State aid. If more than twenty applied, they would receive aid *pro rata*.” This appropriation (\$4,000,) was continued annually till 1840, for about forty pupils.

From 1840 to 1863, inclusive, the annual appropriation was \$6,500. The expenditure averaged about \$7,000 for an average of sixty pupils.

With the increased rates the expenditure—

For 1864 was about	\$11,000 00
1865 “	16,000 00
1866 “	17,000 00

for an average of ninety pupils.

The appropriation for 1867 is \$16,000.

The expenditure for clothing, &c., for the year ending October 1, 1866, was about \$900. Present number of pupils, 101.

Of the 1,700 pupils at the Asylum since its opening, Massachusetts has contributed 515, of whom 486 received aid from the State.

With the exception of one year, aid was confined to pupils between 14 and 25 years of age until 1843. In that year it was extended to pupils from 8 to 25, and so continues. The term, except in special cases, was limited to four or five years, until 1843 when it was increased to six years, its present length. In 1853 the governor was authorized to extend the term two years to not exceeding six pupils to enter the high class.

* Resolves 1817, chap. 24; 1818, chap. 93; 1819, chap. 44; 1820, chaps. 60 and 117; 1824, chaps. 18 and 29; 1825, chaps. 83 and 87; 1827, chaps. 35 and 79; 1828, chap. 97; Governor's Messages 1829, 1830, 1832; 1829, chap. 41; 1832, chap. 13; 1837, chap. 79; 1841, chap. 45; 1843, chap. 79; 1847, chap. 94; 1853, chap. 84; 1864, chap. 38; 1865, chap. 50; Acts 1865, chap. 35; Resolves 1866, chap. 88. Reports of Board of State Charities, 1865, 1866, 1867.

MANAGEMENT OF THE ASYLUM.

Your Committee are glad to be able to speak in terms of highest commendation of the American Asylum. The managers have conducted its affairs with wise economy, and have exhibited an earnest desire, by repeated investigations at home and abroad, to introduce the best methods of teaching. This investigation it is believed they will continue, and that they are not so wedded to their present system as to be unwilling to modify it if their own or others' experiments shall encourage them to do so.

Your Committee desire especially to commend the faithfulness and ability of Rev. Collins Stone, principal, and of his predecessor, Mr. W. W. Turner, who was for forty-two years connected with the Asylum.

The teachers are cultivated, patient and faithful ; the pupils cheerful and well cared for. The various legislative committees in past years and the board of state charities have uniformly approved of the general management of the institution, the latter differing only in opinion upon the method of teaching.

And the affectionate interest in their alma mater which was exhibited at the hearings by the adult mutes who had been pupils at the asylum, was good evidence of their happy experience there ; while their local pride, home influence and social affection have induced them to favor a State institution. Their silence, more eloquent than any uttered word, was not lost upon the Committee.

BOARD OF GOVERNMENT.

As we have stated, when the Asylum was established, citizens of Massachusetts contributed about one-half the funds raised by subscription, and the donors participated in its organization. Of the fifty-two members of the board of government, there were nineteen Massachusetts men. It is a "close corporation," and elects its own members. It now appears that there are no directors from any New England State except Connecticut, and all are from Hartford.

It has been repeatedly said, and correctly, that it is not a Connecticut institution, that it "was established as much by Massachusetts men as Connecticut men." Your Committee

believe this, and they believe too that Massachusetts has her original rights, both as to its advantages and in its government, cannot lose them, and ought not to have lost the enjoyment of them. But so far as its government is concerned, it is no longer a New England institution. It was originally a "partnership of the six States of New England, each having the same and equal rights, and the same and equal advantages." (*Day*, Appendix, page 138.)

The following quotations from the annual reports of the Asylum will sustain the same idea:—"The directors have made the large fund committed to their care the common property of New England." "The importance of several contiguous States uniting in the support of one school for the deaf and dumb, is essential to its permanent usefulness and prosperity."

Mr. Day, vice-president, stated to the Committee that "Massachusetts has an interest of \$200,000 in the property of the Asylum."

Massachusetts does not "patronize" the Asylum; she avails herself of the advantages of an institution in which she has a joint interest. She has always furnished one-third, and now furnishes nearly one-half of its pupils. The present managers feel a confidence in the soundness of their position and management, every one commends their faithfulness, and they would have no fear from unprejudiced men from any locality. They evidently seek only the best interests of the school, and are not so wedded to any policy as to refuse all change.

The representatives of the Asylum before the Committee seemed disposed to recognize this "partnership," and to recommend, at the next annual meeting, the election of directors from each New England State. It seems a matter for surprise, that the places of vice-presidents and directors from New England, who have been removed by death or other causes, were not filled by men from the same localities, the alleged reason being the non-attendance of non-resident directors.

The people of these States have not, by the lapse of time, changed their relations to the original subscriptions, nor to the original grant, in obtaining which it is fair to presume all the representatives of New England participated. If one vice-president and two directors could be chosen from each New

England State, and such others from the vicinity of the institution as convenience demanded, all practical purposes would be accomplished. The new members would come to their position animated by the same desire for the welfare of these "wards" of their several Commonwealths, and with a freshness of interest, which would scarcely fail to result in new vigor.

This return to the original policy of the institution would remove much of the natural sensitiveness as to locality, would conduce to greater harmony and a united confidence, and would make the people of all these States feel that their joint ownership is recognized.

WARDS.

Your Committee find the deaf-mute pupils of the State included among the "dependent classes." In this connection they desire to say, that the policy and practice of the Commonwealth is, to give every child an education, and attendance upon school is compulsory between certain ages. No exception is made as to his ability or infirmity, and the doors of a school are open in every district to every child. But the teacher, representing the State, finds at the door a deaf-mute child, whom he is incompetent to teach, or to whom he is unable to devote time enough to teach. His heart is full of sympathy, and he says to the child: "God has denied to you the power to acquire our system of education, or rather, has denied to me the ability readily to adapt our system to your infirmity, or to inaugurate and carry out a system fitted to your necessities. But you have a right to an education, nevertheless."

The Commonwealth recognizes this right, but says: "While it is neither economical nor convenient to teach you at home, we must not deny to you the privileges accorded to other children, and will send you to an institution adapted to your necessities;" and so the child becomes a "ward of the Commonwealth." He is a ward, just as much, and no more, than any other child attending a public school. True, it may be said, we "support" the child during his term at the Asylum; but need we do so if we educate him as we do other pupils, at his own door? His parents would then provide for him as they do for their other children. For our convenience, and

for economy's sake, we adopt a special course to educate him. The parent pays his portion of the school tax. We deprive him of the society of his child, loved the more because of his infirmity, but we ought not longer to call that child a charity pupil.

With these views, as the care of the Commonwealth over her deaf-mutes seems to be for purposes of education, and not of support, your Committee will recommend that they be hereafter under the supervision of the board of education, who have charge of the educational interests of the State.

This recommendation grows out of the views heretofore indicated, and of the frequent complaint [that this class of pupils are now associated in an annual report with the paupers, criminals and charities of the Commonwealth. But we desire most emphatically to state, that we intend by this recommendation no reflection upon the board of state charities, who have hitherto had this care.

We trust we shall never forget what the chairman of that board, Dr. Howe, has done for Massachusetts, for the world, in his devotion to the interests of suffering humanity everywhere. We would not dim the lustre of a noble life by even an apparent criticism. He disclaimed before the Committee any intention of being connected with a new institution of deaf-mutes if it be established; but in what he has done in this work we believe he has been influenced by the demands of duty, the welfare of the mutes and the best interests of the State.

And we are glad to recognize the constant devotion of the secretary of the board, Mr. Sanborn, to a service which few would undertake, and in which few would find success. His laborious research in the field, not readily accessible, which is now under consideration, deserves especial notice. He will be willing to wait for the future to do justice to what he has done and is doing.

A LONGER TERM.

For hearing and speaking children we provide free primary, grammar, high and normal schools, and while they, in full possession of all their faculties may attend school fifteen years if they choose, we limit the term to six years to the unfortunate

deaf-mute. Because he has a providential infirmity, there seems no reason why he should not enjoy the best opportunities to overcome it. The standard should not be the ability to hear and speak, but the ability to get an education.

The only question the managers at Hartford have needed to consider heretofore has been, If a term of six years only is allowed, between what ages would it be most profitable? and they have decided that to be between eight and fourteen.

We may remark that other States have a longer term, viz.: "New York and New Jersey, ten years, Connecticut, eight."—(*Chase*, Appendix, page 19.)

With these views your Committee will recommend an extension of the term now allowed to deaf-mute pupils aided by the State.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION.

It also appears that the annual appropriation is not large enough to enable the governor and council to meet all the applications of pupils to go to the Asylum—that usually there are several waiting their turn. It seems to your Committee there should be no delay in this matter, and that an additional appropriation should be made at once to provide for present applications, and such a recommendation will be made.

MISS ROGERS' SCHOOL.

If anything would have induced your Committee to become partisans, it would have been the success of Miss H. B. Rogers, who, with her assistant, Miss Byam, has been for a few months conducting a school of six or eight pupils at Chelmsford, teaching only by articulation and lip-reading. She has a native energy, and an enthusiasm for a new work which does not recognize the possibility of failure. A visitor has said: "Her strong faith and her determination to succeed render what would, under other circumstances, prove the severest drudgery, a labor of love." The attainments of the children in the few months that they have been under her care are surprising and encouraging.

Her success is another proof of a truth which our late war has developed, that woman has more energy, tact, perseverance and capacity than have heretofore been acknowledged.

Nor is it strange that woman should have best success with lessons by the lips. Thousands of men, with every faculty perfect and intensified, have thus learned their happiest and their saddest lessons, and oftenest by a silent expression! And in this connection it may be said, that in the use of the sign language at Hartford, and at the public hearings here, your Committee noticed the greater tact and rapidity exhibited by the female mutes. Nature will have it that woman shall somehow retain and enjoy the privilege of expressing more words in a given time than is vouchsafed to her brethren!

The success attending the teaching of Miss Hubbard, of Boston, and Miss Lippitt, of Providence, by articulation and lip-reading, has been remarkable. Their parents and teachers are entitled to the gratitude of the public for their efforts, which do not seem to have been made solely for their own and their children's happiness and welfare, but that others may be encouraged to make similar endeavors.

PURPOSES AND OPINIONS.

The suggestions and desires of those who favored a change of policy may be gathered from the following extracts:—

“We might have schools established in the Commonwealth in which they (the pupils,) should be prepared to be sent to the school at Hartford, at an age when their parents would allow them to go so far from home.”—(*Dr. Howe*, page 5.)

“Leaving those now at Hartford to go on with their instruction there.” “That at the end of the current year, (May or June,) the governor be authorized to employ suitable persons and establish suitable places for the instruction of our deaf-mutes at home.”—(*Same*, page 13.)

“After I had trained the child to a perfect knowledge of articulation, then I would give him the means of addressing people at a distance.” (*Same*, page 48.)

“I have always maintained, though I am, to some extent, a friend to the teaching of articulation, that this question can be decided without the slightest reference to the method of articulation, so far as there is any controversy about it. Everybody admits, I believe, that articulation, up to a certain point, is useful and even necessary. Mr. Turner

and Mr. Stone are willing that a certain number of pupils can and should be taught to articulate. We think that number is larger than they do. But with regard to the other class, the congenital deaf-mutes, although I have a very decided opinion in regard to teaching them articulation, I suppose we should let that question go.”—(*Sanborn*, page 218.)

The views that I have been led to adopt are these :—

1. That some deaf-mutes can be taught to articulate who are congenitally deaf; that is, those who have never heard.

2. That those who at an early period have lost their faculty of speech can be taught to articulate.

3. That those who preserve some portion of their hearing can also be taught to articulate.

4. That all, without great difficulty, can be taught to read from the lips.—(*Hubbard*, page 7.)

“Where articulation is taught, the use of signs or of the manual alphabet should be entirely discarded.”—(*Same*, page 7.)

“I would recommend a trial in teaching congenital deaf-mutes. Should want to take a child of a little more than ordinary capacity, or one who had had more than usual opportunities of being taught.”—(*Same*, page 9.)

“I would teach deaf-mutes who cannot articulate, the use of the English language by using to a certain extent what they call natural signs.”—(*Same*, page 198.)

“What definite, what practical plan do we propose for the education of deaf-mutes? It is this, gentlemen. That you shall give to some gentleman who will make the necessary application, a charter for the purpose of establishing one or more schools in this State for the instruction of deaf-mutes. That charter being granted, we propose to ask that the State shall make the same appropriation to scholars who may desire to go to these schools that they do to those who go to Hartford. We do not wish to begin on any great scale. We have no objection to having the age limited at first to those from five to ten years. We propose to continue the school now at Chelmsford, where semi-mutes and semi-deaf people, and those congenital deaf-mute children whose parents may desire to attempt their instruction in articulation, may be sent. Then we propose to open another school at Boston, where other deaf-mutes may be taught, perhaps by the language of

signs, (for we will not object to using any system by which we can teach the deaf-mutes, although I do not myself believe in the language of signs,) but using more the manual alphabet than signs. Then we propose to establish another school, if you please, in Northampton. Beginning in a small, humble way, we wish to see if we cannot teach these semi-mutes, if we cannot, by beginning at the early age of five years, restore articulation to those who have lost it, and fit them for some higher school—fit them, if you please, for Hartford; but, at any rate preserve for these young semi-mutes, their powers of articulation.”

“But I am not wedded to the idea of teaching articulation to deaf-mutes; I doubt very much whether it can be taught to congenital deaf-mutes; but I do believe in teaching these young semi-mutes the English language.”—(*Same*, pages 205–6.)

EXPATRIATION.

1. Your Committee do not fully sympathize with His Excellency in his views of “expatriation.” It does not seem to them that we ought to have an extreme sensitiveness about State lines,—nor that the distance to or inconvenience in reaching Hartford much exceeds any point within the State, and if the child is to be taken away from home, a difference of twenty miles more or less is unimportant. Our joint interest in the American Asylum, may overcome our local pride, and we may well “count the cost,” if not at the sacrifice of the best interests of the pupils. At the same time we agree that, “we must consider not how we can have the cheapest instruction, but how we can have the best.”

The facilities and long experience of the Hartford institution ought not to be overlooked, unless greater advantages can be shown from a new public institution than have been made apparent to your Committee.

EARLIER EDUCATION.

2. Your Committee are entirely agreed, that deaf-mutes should have an opportunity for earlier education than is now afforded at the Hartford Asylum. The two younger classes there now average eleven and twelve and a quarter years. While the managers of that institution believe that home influence is best until a child is eight years of age, we are

by no means certain that they would not consent to receive younger pupils, if our State did not limit the term to six years. In the meantime,—

3. "Private Munificence," alluded to in the governor's address, represented by a large-hearted citizen of Northampton, to whom, let us be grateful in advance, proposes to establish and endow an institution for deaf-mutes at that place. Your Committee will recommend the incorporation of such a school and such legislation as will give pupils of tender years an opportunity for primary instruction in that or any other school which the governor and council deem suitable for the purpose.

We ought to remark that it is understood that this new school is not committed in advance to either system of deaf-mute education.

4. The school of Miss Rogers, of Chelmsford, herein before named, will be sustained by other men with open hand and purse, and her experiment will be fairly tried. It is proposed that State pupils may be sent to this school by approval of the governor and council.

5. This legislation will presume upon no change of our relations to the American Asylum, either in regard to Massachusetts pupils now there or to any who may apply to be sent there hereafter, nor will it indicate any censure upon its management or opinions upon its system. At the same time it will give an opportunity for earlier education, and partially accomplish some of the other purposes of those who favor a change of policy.

6. Some action appears necessary from the fact that the Asylum now has as many pupils as it can well provide for, or as many as seems desirable in one institution. There will be a natural increase in numbers by increase of population, and the proposed change of limit as to age and length of term, will add considerably to the present number.

SUMMARY.

Your Committee have said that they did not propose to make an extended argument upon methods, but briefly to submit the conclusions to which they have arrived from the evidence submitted and upon which they base their recommendations.

They find—

1. That both the French and German systems have been taught for centuries.

2. That both are taught in all the principal deaf-mute schools in this and other countries, except in Germany and in the London institution, where “ articulation ” is chiefly relied upon.

3. That the sign language and manual alphabet can be taught to all classes of deaf persons and deaf-mutes, and are the most effectual means of communicating information to a large majority of such persons.

4. The advocates of both systems admit that “ articulation ” can be taught to some deaf-mutes, but not to all—but differ as to the number. It is a question of proportions. The fact that it has been adopted by so small a portion of the schools throughout the world, seems a strong argument against its exclusive use in any school intended for all classes of deaf-mutes.

Your Committee believe, that to the majority of those congenitally deaf, or who lost their hearing in infancy, it cannot be successfully taught; but that it can be to the majority of semi-mutes and semi-deaf persons.

5. That the ability to articulate is so great a blessing that it ought to be retained or restored, if there be a possibility of doing so, even at the sacrifice of some other advantages. That the earlier the effort is made, the greater the hope of success.

6. That success depends in some measure upon faith in either theory; and that the danger is that the advocates of each will be too much wedded to their favorite method. But that no public school ought to be exclusively devoted to either.

7. That lip reading or lip signs, (it is really but another sign language,) may be taught to nearly all pupils, and there does not seem to be any necessary connection between it and “ articulation,” nor does it appear why it may not be learned by children entirely incapable of articulation; or be taught with or by the manual system or *vice versa*. A child having learned the ordinary sign for “ boy,” for instance, or the letters b-o-y, can be taught the lip sign for the same word or for the several letters.

So that while he may be unable to communicate by the lips, either audibly or silently, he may be thus addressed. And to

know this language would seem to bring him into nearer relations with all speaking persons than any other, and could be made available in individual conversation, though not in public addresses. It is true there is a want of uniformity in the expression of the same word by the lips of different persons. Your Committee found this strikingly illustrated in their examination of the lip-reading pupils, presented to them, for while one member of the Committee could be readily understood by them, another would entirely fail, although uttering the same sentence with equal care.

This is further exemplified in the letter of Rev. Mr. Harlow, a deaf clergyman, (Appendix, page 232,) who says:—

“In order to ‘read on the lips of an individual,’ it is necessary that he should speak plainly, deliberately, distinctly, and show an expressive face. Those who wear a full beard, raise their voices to a loud tone, speak with great rapidity, so as to run their words together, are very verbose with long sentences, show little or no movement of the lips, or keep their teeth closed together, are seldom or never understood at all.”

8. That the evils of “aggregation in intensifying an infirmity,” do not seem great enough to recommend the abandonment of large institutions, or to counterbalance the advantages which they offer.

9. That a small number only can be taught lip-reading by one teacher, and that when learned it can be made available only in a favorable light and at short distances. Your Committee felt that at the several hearings, the deaf-mutes present, if they had been taught lip-reading only, could not have obtained any clear idea of the proceedings, which they were enabled to do, by the manual signs of Prof. Bartlett, who acted as interpreter.

CONCLUSIONS.

Your Committee recommend the passage of the accompanying Bills, which provide—

1. For the incorporation of an institution for deaf-mutes at Northampton.

2. For primary instruction of younger pupils than are now received at the American Asylum.

3. For a longer term of instruction than has heretofore been allowed to pupils aided by the State.

4. For an additional appropriation to enable the governor to answer the existing applications of pupils requiring State aid.

5. For the supervision by the board of education of all deaf-mute pupils aided by the Commonwealth.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

For the Committee,

FRANK B. FAY.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In the Year One Thousand Eight Hundred and Sixty-Seven.

AN ACT

To incorporate the Clarke Institution for Deaf-Mutes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives, in General Court assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows:—

1 SECT. 1. Osmyn Baker, William Allen, junior,
2 Lewis J. Dudley, Julius H. Seelye, George Walker,
3 Gardiner G. Hubbard, Theodore Lyman, Horatio G.
4 Knight, Joseph A. Pond, William Clafin, James B.
5 Congdon, Thomas Talbot, their associates and succes-
6 sors, are hereby made a corporation by the name of the
7 Clarke Institution for Deaf-Mutes, at Northampton,
8 with authority to establish classes of instruction for deaf
9 persons and deaf-mutes in two other suitable localities
10 in this Commonwealth ; with all the powers and priv-
11 ileges, and subject to all the duties, restrictions and
12 liabilities set forth in all general statutes which now
13 are or hereafter may be in force in relation to such
14 corporations.

1 SECT. 2. Said corporation may hold, for the pur-
2 poses aforesaid, real and personal estate, not exceeding
3 in value two hundred thousand dollars.

1 SECT. 3. This act shall take effect upon its
2 passage.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In the Year One Thousand Eight Hundred and Sixty-Seven.

AN ACT

Concerning the Education of Deaf-Mutes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives, in General Court assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows :—

1 SECT. 1. The governor, with the approval of the
2 board of education, is hereby authorized to send
3 such deaf-mutes or deaf children between five and
4 ten years of age, as he may deem fit subjects for
5 instruction at the expense of the Commonwealth, to
6 the Clarke Institution for Deaf-Mutes at Northamp-
7 ton, or to such schools or classes as now are or may
8 hereafter be established for the education of deaf-
9 mutes in this Commonwealth.

1 SECT. 2. The governor is hereby authorized to
2 draw his warrant for such sums as may be necessary
3 to provide for the instruction and support of the pupils
4 named in the preceding section, not exceeding for
5 each pupil, the amount which is now or may hereafter

6 be paid by the Commonwealth, for the education and
7 support of deaf-mutes at the American Asylum at
8 Hartford.

1 SECT. 3. The education of all deaf-mutes who are
2 now receiving or may hereafter receive instruction at
3 the expense of the Commonwealth, shall be subject
4 to the direction and supervision of the board of educa-
5 tion, and said board shall set forth in their annual
6 report the number of pupils so instructed, the cost of
7 their instruction and support, the way in which the
8 money appropriated by the state has been expended,
9 and such other information as said board may deem
10 important to be laid before the legislature.

1 SECT. 4. The governor is hereby authorized to
2 extend to ten years the term of instruction now
3 granted to deaf-mutes educated at the expense of the
4 Commonwealth.

1 SECT. 5. The sum of three thousand dollars is
2 hereby appropriated for the education of deaf-mutes
3 in addition to the amount heretofore appropriated, to
4 be paid from the treasury of the Commonwealth.

1 SECT. 6. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent
2 herewith, are hereby repealed.

1 SECT. 7. This act shall take effect upon its
2 passage.

APPENDIX.

EVIDENCE.

FIRST HEARING.

The first public hearing of the Committee was held January 24. The Chairman (HON. FRANK B. FAY) opened the hearing by reading that portion of His Excellency's Address relating to the subject which the Committee had been appointed to consider. There were present, as representing the friends of the proposed change, Dr. Samuel G. Howe, Chairman, and Frank B. Sanborn, Secretary, of the Board of State Charities, Hon. Thomas Talbot, of the Governor's Council, and Gardiner G. Hubbard, Esq. In the interest of the American Asylum for Deaf-Mutes, at Hartford, Conn., there appeared Rev. Collins Stone, Principal, Rev. W. W. Turner, former Principal, and Hon. Calvin Day, one of its Vice-Presidents. A large number of deaf-mutes were also in attendance, with Professor D. E. Bartlett as interpreter.

DR. SAMUEL G. HOWE, of Boston, addressed the Committee in support of the recommendation of His Excellency. He said: As chairman of the Board of State Charities, I would answer to the invitation to make the opening, by stating that it is entirely unexpected to the Board, and especially to myself, to be called upon to do so. It will be recollected that, in their last Annual Report, the Board of State Charities went pretty fully into the consideration of this matter of the instruction of deaf-mutes, and set forth the reasons why they proposed that measures be taken to have mutes instructed at home. The Governor has recommended that initiatory steps be taken towards such an education, and the Board naturally expected that those who represent the opposite view would make their statements and make their objections to this policy; and I should very much prefer that they would. And in my present state of health I am not able to go into the statement of the matter as I would like. And a further reason why I should prefer not to go into it at present, is that some two months ago the Board opened communication with different gentlemen in Europe, (in France and Belgium,) with a view of ascertaining exactly what the results were of the new measures adopted by the French government and by the Russian gov-

ernment for breaking up the great central establishments in Europe for deaf-mutes, and substituting therefor smaller ones located in different parts of the country and in the different towns, where there may be, as some express it, a popularizing or vulgarizing of the instruction—considering it no longer as a special art, but as one which can be acquired by teachers of ordinary studies—with a view, first, of relieving the State of the very great charge of sending their children to Paris or the larger towns, and enabling them to be educated in their own separate communities. Among other steps taken by the French government was the establishment of a normal school in Paris in which teachers could be trained to teach deaf-mutes. For instance : a town in France, a municipality, sends a teacher to Paris ; I mean a teacher of the ordinary district schools. She goes to the normal school at Paris, and there, in a certain length of time, learns whatever is considered necessary in this instruction, and then returns to her district and her school, thus carrying the instruction all over the country, instead of carrying the mutes to the instruction. This system has been in operation some time in France, and also in Russia. And there has been a very strong movement—a movement carrying considerable weight with it—in Belgium. The Board sometime ago took measures to get the actual results of these modifications of the system. As yet, we have received returns but from one source, and that in Belgium ; but we are daily expecting returns of more importance.

In view, then, of the proposed measures, and the state of matters as they now appear, I should very much prefer that the gentlemen who do not favor the keeping of our children at home should make their statement. I would remark, merely in general, that those conversant with the history of the subject will see that it has been considered a matter of course that Massachusetts should adopt the same policy with regard to her deaf-mutes as she does in regard to the offices of instruction and charity of every kind, namely, to discharge the responsibilities reposed in her by the citizens of the Commonwealth, not abroad, but at home, by her own citizens and under her own eye : so that, if it shall appear that there is any better mode of instruction for these children, it may be adopted ; whereas now she has no more power to adopt any change than if they were in Pennsylvania or Timbuctoo. The whole thing is intrusted to persons beyond the limits of the State. I would not be understood to say that the gentlemen at Hartford have not discharged all their duties, and discharged them thoroughly and to the best of their ability. I never lose an opportunity of saying that Massachusetts owes to Connecticut a debt of gratitude for her care of these unfortunate children. We all know how eminent in ability and how faithful and zealous are the teachers of that institution. And, as

one of the Board, I discard entirely all thought of any dissatisfaction. Though I do disagree with them, *toto cælo*, as to their method of instruction, I do say that the institution has been the means of accomplishing a great amount of good. If we go back to the commencement of this institution, it will be seen that the idea goes forth in its name that it was not to be anything like a State institution, but national. The Connecticut Asylum, as it was first called, was called afterwards the American Asylum for Deaf-Mutes. Why not New England? Why not Connecticut? Because in that day it was supposed that it would be sufficient for the country. Very soon afterwards, however, there was one started in Kentucky. The United States made appropriations for that school, and divided the appropriations between the New England school and the Kentucky school, supposing that the two institutions would be enough for the whole country. It was soon found that they would not suffice, and the number has increased to twenty-four or twenty-five, showing clearly that this original idea of two institutions sufficing for the whole country was utterly wrong. It sprang out of ignorance upon the subject. And gentlemen at Hartford have expressed the idea to me that this transportation to Massachusetts of her own pupils is only a question of time. The Board think the time has come, mainly for reasons set forth in their report of last year, and for the additional reason that they find, after investigation, that the number of mutes in the Commonwealth is very much greater than is represented by the number of those who are at Hartford. I think the number at Hartford from Massachusetts, within the past year, was one hundred and fourteen (114); that is, including the public and private beneficiaries. We are satisfied that there are at least a hundred and fifty within the proper age. Now, we hold that all considerations favor the idea that we must not congregate these children together in great numbers. We have got to look at the expense of transportation, and we have got to look at the expense of classification; and this very consideration is against further aggregation in numbers. The great law of nature in this class of unfortunates, as in all other classes, demands that they should be brought, as far as possible, under the ordinary influences of society. The whole object of their education is to counteract the effects growing out of their condition. How do we do this? By subjecting them to the ordinary social influences, so that they shall escape the effects of their condition. And we hold that undue congregation of these persons involves the unfavorable effects growing out of their infirmity. Like all other abnormalities, there should be a division among the community, subjecting them to the ordinary healthful influences of society. We hold, therefore, that in that view, having acquired a sufficient number for the purposes of classification, and after

due consideration of the expense, we should not, further than this, have an aggregation of these persons. And I put it to any member of the Committee whether it is not better if his child has any peculiarities that distinguish it, that he should take every possible measure to keep them out of sight even of the child itself, and bring the child under ordinary influences of society, so that, when it comes into society, it shall not have anything peculiar. A little reflection will show that the aggregation of these persons together does increase these peculiarities. We hold, moreover, with those gentlemen in Europe most conversant with this matter, that, in order to train a deaf-mute child as he ought to be trained, you should begin with him just as early as he can leave the mother's apron-strings. Even in Germany they begin at four years of age. Now, what is the main object of the instruction at Hartford? Gentlemen will tell you that the idea is mainly to learn language. When do you teach your children? They have learned a good deal at six or eight years, before they are able to go to Hartford. We know that at this tender age parents are reluctant to have their children go away from home. And how much more is this felt when these children are mere dependents? We urge therefore the necessity of beginning at home at an early period, and having schools for the instruction of these children in early years. And I should plead most earnestly that we might have schools established in the Commonwealth in which they should be prepared to be sent to the school at Hartford, at an age when their parents will allow them to go so far from home.

Mr. Chairman, I did not mean, when I got up, to do more than ask to be excused, but I have insensibly gone thus far. We shall be able to show the Committee in the course of two weeks, perhaps, the results of some training of children of tender age. A school has been opened at Chelmsford for some seven or eight months, and the results, which are interesting and important, we should be glad to show to the Committee, although we are not in condition to make any exhibition.

Rev. Mr. STONE. This arrangement, Mr. Chairman, for the education of the deaf and dumb of Massachusetts, has been in existence about fifty years. It is acceptable to the directors of the Hartford Asylum, and they prefer on the whole to have it continued. It certainly belongs to the gentlemen who desire any change made to state their reasons distinctly, and when they have done so, we shall perhaps be prepared to meet them.

The Committee decided first to hear those who favored the Governor's recommendation; and Mr. FRANK B. SANBORN, Secretary of the Board of State Charities, said :—

I would say, that perhaps the remark of the Chairman of the Board of State Charities, with regard to the state of preparation on the part of the members of that Board in regard to this question, may lead to misapprehension. Upon some points we are not prepared, but upon certain points I can say, for one, that I am fully prepared to bring forward arguments in favor of the removal, and also that there are gentlemen present, not members of the Board, who are not only willing, but desirous of presenting their statements. I would not desire, and I am quite sure that Dr. Howe would not desire, to have this hearing suspended in any way on account of tardiness on the part of those who favor the removal. The ground which we have been disposed to take, is substantially the ground which is taken by the Governor in his message. And this is (and it has just been stated by Dr. Howe), that the education of deaf-mutes in the State of Massachusetts is something so natural, and commends itself so much to the common sense of all persons who consider the matter for the first time, that we supposed there must be some strong reason against it, if it was not to be done. We have, for the past fifty years, sent our pupils out of the State to an institution of which no one can speak higher than I. But the time has come when, as we think, a change is demanded. It is not, however, proposed, in making this change, to remove the children now at Hartford, but to provide for the future instruction of our pupils within the State. With regard to that, some are ready at the present time to make statements, and others will be hereafter. We supposed that in a matter of this kind, and of this importance, it would be necessary to hold more than one hearing. It is a matter which in some parts has been little discussed in this country, and therefore it is necessary to obtain light from other sources.

Mr. G. G. HUBBARD. I am not very well to-day, Mr. Chairman, and therefore cannot say much upon this subject, nor with that degree of order that I should be glad to. I have a little girl eight or nine years old, who had an attack of the scarlet fever four years since, when she entirely lost her hearing, and has been a deaf-mute from that time to this. When she lost her hearing, her articulation was exceedingly imperfect; she could neither read nor write, and did not know all of her letters. For some months after the fever left her, her bodily health was very poor indeed, and it was two years before she recovered her entire strength, so that during all of from six to nine months, she was running behind in her knowledge of all subjects. The question naturally arose with us what we should do with her. We were told that the only way was, when the proper time came, to send her to Hartford. We went to see Dr. Howe in regard to it, and he gave us very great

encouragement that we could preserve her articulation, and could teach her to read from the lips. Prof. Bartlett gave us some encouragement, though not so much by any means as Dr. Howe. We have succeeded in preserving her articulation. We have had, for some time past, a governess in the family for the purpose of teaching the child, and she is now fully as far advanced in ordinary studies as children of her age. Her articulation is of course very imperfect, but still it is preserved, and when she speaks slowly and distinctly, strangers can understand her. She is ignorant of the manual alphabet, so that all the knowledge she has obtained has been by reading from the lips. Watching the progress made by her, I have become interested in the subject of the teaching of deaf-mutes, and have paid some attention to that question of late years. A few years since, there was a young child, a deaf-mute, brought to this city for the purpose of seeing if anything could be done for her. She was taken to Mrs. Lamson, a lady who was formerly an assistant of Dr. Howe, and who for some little time had the care of Laura Bridgman. The child could then speak one or two words—that was all; and those very indistinctly. Mrs. Lamson procured a teacher for her, a Miss Rogers, of Billerica, whose sister was formerly a teacher of deaf-mutes. She had very good success in teaching this little child, and about seven months ago a school was started at Chelmsford for the instruction of deaf-mutes. That school has been continued from that time until the present, and with a very fair degree of success. Some gentlemen who are here have visited the school and can speak of the progress that has been made. The views that I have been led to adopt, from watching my own child, and watching the progress made in this school, are these:—

1. That some deaf-mutes can be taught to articulate who are congenitally deaf; that is, those who have never heard.
2. That those who at an early period have lost their faculty of speech can be taught to articulate.
3. That those who preserve some portion of their hearing can also be taught to articulate.
4. That all, without great difficulty, can be taught to read from the lips.

And another point to which I have been brought is this: that, as a general rule, wherever articulation is taught, the use of signs or of the manual alphabet should be entirely discarded. The fact that there have been in this country a few children taught to articulate is well known to the gentlemen from Hartford. That they have been taught abroad, more or less, is also admitted by the gentlemen from Hartford. We understand that they think that in Europe the teaching of articulation has not been carried to any great success, and that in the few cases

where articulation has been taught with any degree of success in our own country, as in the case of my own child, and in the case of Miss Lippitt, of Providence, it has only been done by considerable expense; and that it would be impracticable to teach deaf-mutes, as a general rule. From my own knowledge of the school at Chelmsford, I think the teaching can be carried on principally by females, and that so the cost of instruction can be very greatly reduced, so that the same number of scholars could be probably instructed with very nearly the same expense as at other institutions. It does not require any particular art or skill in the teacher to instruct deaf-mutes. That I know of my own knowledge. It requires patience and constant application. And I know this, too, from the education of my own child, that the more that child is brought into connection with children that talk and articulate, the greater is her progress. And my belief is that if she had to be in an asylum with deaf-mutes, she would soon lose all her faculty of articulation and of reading from the lips. She now plays with all the little girls, and goes to dancing-school, and, after a little while, it is our intention to send her to other schools with other children. I have thus stated that there were three classes of deaf-mutes who could be, in my opinion, taught this method of articulation. These three classes embrace, I believe, from one-half to three-fourths of the entire number of deaf-mutes in this Commonwealth; so that there are, therefore, a large number who could be reached by this particular method of teaching articulation. And it has therefore seemed to me that it was a plan which was to be thoroughly tried by this State, that we might see whether articulation could not be taught to these three classes. I think, from my own observation, that the two methods of instruction,—that is, by the use of signs, and by articulation,—cannot be carried on together. One must be taught to the exclusion of the other. Therefore it is not well to send a child who can talk, or who can hear, to the school at Hartford, where the sign language chiefly is used to communicate instruction. Exactly how this plan is to be carried out I cannot state. I had thought that, as the matter was brought before the Committee, the views of gentlemen who are here from Hartford might be developed as to whether a school might not be started at some central point, where articulation could be taught, and taught alone, and that from time to time other schools might be opened in other parts of the State. Of course it would not do to undertake to teach all the children at an asylum in Massachusetts. That would be a work which I think no one would undertake at once. But as we find what our strength and success are, our work can go on. At some future time, I shall hope to have the Committee hear Miss Rogers, and also my own child, and some of the children with Miss Rogers. If gentlemen

have any questions which they desire to ask, I shall be very happy to answer them.

Mr. DUDLEY. Can strangers understand your daughter?

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Stone can perhaps answer as to that.

Mr. STONE. In many common things she speaks with entire distinctness; that is a common thing.

Mr. DUDLEY. Can she read the lips of a stranger as well as of her teacher?

Mr. HUBBARD. Dr. Howe or Mr. Sanborn can answer that question.

Mr. SANBORN. I can say in regard to that, that the only occasion of my seeing the daughter of Mr. Hubbard was for about two hours, I think, that I spent in his house one day when I dined with him. I talked with this girl, and asked questions in geography, and heard her recite poetry, and she also asked questions; and I believe we answered the questions to our mutual satisfaction. Of course it is not possible to have in a child only nine years old, the same proficiency as in those who have had the advantages received at Hartford. I do not mean that the same distinctness was found as in some others; but there was no difficulty in understanding this child such as to interfere with the ordinary business of life. I think that in performing the ordinary duties of life, she could make herself understood with sufficient ease, though not with the ease of people generally.

Mr. FAY. I understand you to say that some persons can be taught to articulate who were born deaf-mutes?

Mr. HUBBARD. Yes, sir; I know that is so. We have not sufficient experience in this country to tell exactly how.

Mr. DUDLEY. Would you recommend teaching all congenital deaf-mutes, or merely making a trial of them?

Mr. HUBBARD. I would recommend a trial.

Mr. DUDLEY. What would be the criterion by which to judge?

Mr. HUBBARD. Well, I should want to take a child of a little more than ordinary capacity, I think, or one that had had more than usual opportunities of being taught.

Mr. DUDLEY. Of being taught in what way?

Mr. HUBBARD. Of being taught by articulation. For instance, the earlier you begin with a deaf-mute, the more pliable will be her organs of speech, and the easier it will be for them to articulate; so that if you take one child and begin with her at four years of age, and another with equal powers, and begin at twelve, the one would be able to make considerable advancement, and the other would probably be powerless.

Mr. DUDLEY. How do you determine in regard to children at the age of four years, who have not had any instruction at all? What shall be the criterion whether you shall commence by articulation or by some other method?

Mr. HUBBARD. That might depend upon the circumstances of the case. If the child were of poor parents, I should not attempt articulation.

Mr. BIRD. Let it grow up in ignorance?

Mr. HUBBARD. No, sir; I should send it to Hartford. I do not consider that in this country we have sufficient experience to say that articulation should be the sole means of instruction for deaf-mutes.

Mr. DUDLEY. Which is the hardest, to teach articulation or to teach to read from the lips?

Mr. HUBBARD. Well, they both go on together; you cannot well separate one from the other. I should think it was more difficult to teach articulation than to teach reading from the lips.

Mr. DUDLEY. Would it make a difference if the lips were covered with beard?

Mr. HUBBARD. I do not think it would make very much difference; a stranger must speak slowly.

Prof. BARTLETT. I should like to ask whether, in undertaking to teach signs or the manual alphabet, progress is necessarily retarded?

Mr. HUBBARD. So far as signs are concerned, if you undertake to teach a child signs and the manual alphabet, you are, I think, undertaking to teach a child two languages; and I think it is hard enough for a person who has all his faculties to learn two languages at once. I should therefore confine the child to one language. I think, also, that if you undertake to teach the manual alphabet and articulation at the same time, you distract the attention of the child, and it would be more difficult to teach a child the manual alphabet than it would be otherwise.

Mr. DUDLEY. Is there not the same objection to teaching writing at the same time?

Mr. HUBBARD. It would naturally seem to be so; but, practically speaking, it is entirely different.

Mr. WRIGHT. I understand you, Mr. Hubbard, that you have given considerable attention to this subject?

Mr. HUBBARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. WRIGHT. And I understand that your view is to establish a school at some central point, and, if that prove successful, to establish others?

Mr. HUBBARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. WRIGHT. But not to establish a school and take away the pupils from Hartford?

Mr. HUBBARD. I should not advise anything of the kind.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would like to ask Mr. Hubbard if he has visited the school at Chelmsford.

Mr. HUBBARD. I have heard often from Miss Rogers concerning it, and have seen pupils from there. Mr. Sanborn or Mr. Talbot know all about that institution.

Dr. HOWE. I would take the liberty of directing the attention of the Committee to the statement of Mr. Hubbard with regard to the facilities of teaching articulation to mutes who are congenitally so; and also to the fact that from a recent examination of the pupils of the Hartford school, we ascertained that three-fifths of them were born with hearing. We did not intend to go into a particular method of instruction of deaf-mutes. We had come to no decision further than this (I speak of those gentlemen of the Board who have taken part in the discussion): that after the termination of the present year (terminating, I think, in May,) no more pupils be sent to Hartford, but that arrangements be made in Massachusetts for the instruction of the deaf-mutes from the State. With regard to the particular mode of instruction, I think Mr. Hubbard is quite right in saying that we must leave that to experiment. I am myself, and have been for a long time, an ardent advocate of teaching by articulation; but I do not think that we should confine ourselves to that. If the gentlemen will allow me to go back to 1843, I will state that at that time I went through Germany in company with Horace Mann, then a member of the Board of Education. We went into schools there, and I was astonished at the ease with which we made ourselves understood by the deaf-mute pupils, speaking to them from the lips, he (Mr. Mann) speaking German imperfectly, and I but little better; and still these children, watching our lips, and looking up at us, could understand us instantly, and we could make out what they said, to a great extent. Mr. Mann said to me, "When we get home we must give Massachusetts the benefit of this system;" and up to the day of his death he cherished this idea, and in his last letter to me he made mention of this wish. He picked out that idea as a feature of the German education that should be incorporated into our schools. And we hold, and the friends of this idea hold, that it should be introduced into our own State. But the enemies of this feature (or perhaps not enemies, but those who are opposed to it) hold that this instruction of deaf-mutes is a peculiar art, and that it must go on in a particular way, and only in that way. Allow me to relate an anecdote. There came to me some five years ago, a German whom I did not recognize at first as a deaf-mute, but sometime afterwards noticed a little peculiarity about his speech. He was travelling

in this country alone, without any attendant. He was a remarkable man in this faculty. Of course these are exceptional cases. This man was remarkable in his whole organization. Finding that he talked so well, I remarked to him that I should like to take him into our kitchen, and that I wanted him to talk as if he were not a mute. He consented to do this, and we went into the kitchen, and there I had a servant girl who was also a German, and quite intelligent. I told her that I had brought a man in who spoke German; and they commenced conversation, and continued for some ten minutes, when suddenly she dropped her hands and exclaimed that she had been talking to a "*taubstumm*." Indeed, she could hardly control her emotion on making this discovery. This was, however, quite an extraordinary case. Mr. Hubbard has spoken of the importance of confining the attention of these deaf-mute children to one language, and it is a matter of very great importance. I will illustrate this by the case of Laura Bridgman. It does not require any particular study to teach a deaf-mute. Before seeing Laura Bridgman, I had for a long time been desirous of seeing some person who was both deaf and dumb and blind; and when I heard of little Laura up in New Hampshire, I started off the day afterwards to find her. I had no more knowledge myself of the method of teaching deaf-mutes than you have; but, as you all know, she has been taught a great many things, and we had no difficulty in teaching her. I would not say, perhaps, that we had *no* difficulty; but we had no difficulty which was not overcome. Miss Eliza Rogers was one of her teachers, and also Mrs. Lamson. Her case shows that any one who has natural aptness may be taught. So far, there is nothing peculiarly abstruse about it, requiring long experience and practice. I think that a young man is better than an old man, even if he had no instruction, because he is more vigorous and has more energy; and I would appeal to Prof. Bartlett if he has found deaf-mutes who are so correct in the use of language as Laura Bridgman; and it can be explained only by the fact that, in the very circumstances of the case, she could use but one kind of language. If she could have been sent to a school for the deaf, she would have been confined all the time to the use of signs and the manual alphabet; but, being where nobody could give her signs, she never makes a sign at all. She was restricted, by the necessity of the case, to the use of one single form of language. The consequence was that she had only one particular form of language, and only one way of learning. She had no sight, no hearing, hardly any smell. Most blind and deaf-mute persons whom we have any account of, use the sense of smell as a most important adjunct and aid to the senses. It gives them a thousand perceptions, which they would not have otherwise. Miss Bridgman, without difficulty, has acquired a fluency, dexterity, and

readiness in her language which would otherwise be amazing, were it not for this fact, that she has been confined, by the necessities of the case, to the use of that particular form of language. Therefore, I am inclined to give very much more stress to Mr. Hubbard's view of this matter than I otherwise should. I do not think, however, that the friends of this measure are at this moment prepared to recommend any special mode of instruction* further than that, after the expiration of the current year, the Governor shall be authorized to employ suitable persons and establish suitable places for the instruction of our deaf-mutes at home; and we believe that it can be done without any increase of expense to the State.

Mr. FAY. Shall we understand that the Board of State Charities propose that those now at Hartford be removed from there?

Dr. HOWE. The Board do not propose that any of the mutes now at Hartford should be removed from there, unless some person should desire to take his child from there of his own preference. The plan proposed was to commence instruction at the expiration of the current year, (in May or June, whenever it is,) and then take the pupils as they come, leaving those now at Hartford to go on with their instruction there.

Mr. FAY. How many pupils are there at Chelmsford?

Dr. HOWE. Seven.

Mr. FAY. And how many teachers?

Dr. HOWE. Two.

Mr. TALBOT. I became interested, Mr. Chairman, in this subject from the fact of having had my attention called to the child, Miss Cushing. At first, I had no faith whatever in the method of teaching; but, by observing this case, my sympathies became enlisted; and from seeing the progress made by this little girl, I became convinced that there was a good deal in the system of teaching. Although I do not mean to say, from what I have seen, that the experiment is tried and finished, yet I am satisfied that enough has been developed to warrant the experiment being tried in the State, in order to see if it cannot be done. There are now at Chelmsford seven pupils. Two or three of them were born deaf. And although I am not prepared to go into the details of their improvement, yet, from my general observation, I can state that they have made wonderful improvement in the time they have been there. Their improvement strikes me with astonishment. I visited the school at Hartford on two occasions, and I was astonished there to see the progress that those children had made, and to see the proficiency that they had reached in that institution. But I made no particular comparison of the scholars who had been there the same length of time

as the pupils at Chelmsford. From my general observation, however, I should be inclined to think that those pupils who had been in this institution at Chelmsford the same length of time, would compare very favorably with anything that I saw at Hartford. I have nothing to add to what Mr. Hubbard has said, except that, if the Committee desire, Miss Rogers would be glad to state more in detail the progress that the pupils at Chelmsford have made under their teachers ; and she would like very much if the Committee could visit her school and she could show them there the progress that has been made.

Mr. SANBORN. As Dr. Howe has stated, it has not been the purpose of the Board of State Charities to introduce the matter of articulation. As Mr. Hubbard has brought up that matter, I would like to say that we have persons present who desire to address the Committee on these points. We have here Mr. George Homer, of this city, an educated deaf-mute, who desires to address the Committee, and also Mr. Amos Smith, a gentleman educated at Hartford, now employed at the Registry of Deeds. Mr. Homer has been employed in the Boston Post Office, in this city, and in other responsible positions.

Mr. HOMER then addressed the Committee in the sign language, Prof. D. E. Bartlett acting as interpreter.

Is connected with the Post Office, and very much occupied, and did not have time to write. Will endeavor to give his ideas by signs. Was educated at Hartford ; five years at the school ; from 1825 to '29 or '30. When he heard that Dr. Howe proposed to have a school in Massachusetts, he felt very much interested in the idea, and for this reason : Hartford is distant from here ; they have a number of pupils ; smaller school would be better. He is in favor of articulation ; wants to *try*. He is against a too extended use of signs ; he would curtail the use of signs and use the alphabet language. He is inclined to favor the alphabet and signs ; goes somewhat on the eclectic principle ; wants to see the experiment of a school in Massachusetts ; says they have made great improvements in steam-engines, and thinks they ought to make great improvement in deaf-mute instruction ; goes in for experimenting. He is inclined to fall in with Dr. Howe's views, and wants to try and see what can be done in Massachusetts. He does not like the idea of having a number congregated together, and living together ; it would be well to have them board about and live in families. He wants to try the experiment of smaller schools, upon the plan of the common schools of the country. The parents are often anxious for their children when they are so far separated from them. Speaks of a Miss Alden from Maine ; she went to Hartford, and he afterwards met her and she

expressed herself in favor of a more extended use of the alphabet and less signs. He says an extended use of signs prevents the progress in the use of alphabets.

The question was asked if Mr. Homer had always been deaf. He replied that his hearing had always been imperfect; that he could speak a number of words now; and could speak some before he went to Hartford; his parents taught him to speak a number. [Mr. H. here pronounced several words—father, mother, book, apple, house, tree, sword, tongue, sun, moon, stars, rain, snow, cold, woman, man, lady, how do you do, I am well.] Says he talks about the same now as when he went to Hartford; he learned these before he went to school. He talks now with his relatives and friends. He says he can talk with his relatives, but not with strangers so much. Was not taught articulation at all at Hartford. Mr. Gallaudet was aware of his being able to speak, and spoke to him some words. He can hear somewhat; can hear a bell when he is close by it. [Professor Bartlett spoke the word “apple” loudly close to Mr. Homer’s ear, and Mr. H. repeated the word instantly.] He thinks that if his instruction had been taken up with as much industry and perseverance as were now shown, he could have got along with very little difficulty. He says he feels impressed with the importance of trying to teach persons. He says he has no feeling of opposition to Hartford, but he wants to have everything done here which can be done. [Mr. Hubbard asked if deaf-mutes *thought* in signs or in language. Mr. Homer replied, that he did not know—had not determined the question.]

Professor Bartlett alluded to a case where a person had expressed himself as thinking in French of things in France, and in English of things pertaining to America; and also referred to a child of Professor Agassiz, who expressed himself in French as to animals, and in German concerning plants and flowers, having had a French teacher in entomology, and a German teacher in botany. He thought that the universal law in this matter was that of habit.

Mr. Sanborn remarked that Mr. Homer used signs when talking to himself in the street.

Mr. Sanborn then read to the Committee the following communication from Mr. Amos Smith, of Boston, and also one from Mr. Wm. K. Chase, of Boston, deaf-mutes.

AMOS SMITH’S ADDRESS.

*Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Committee:—*The education of the deaf-mute children of this Commonwealth is a subject of much interest to her people. They are entitled, as a matter of right, to an education, and *as near their parents’ door as possible*, and the system or means of instruction should be a

good one, as faultless as is possible ; and I must say very different from that employed at Hartford.

A deaf-mute myself, a graduate of the Hartford School, I have for years protested against the system which winks at a free, unrestricted license to signs. This sign language tends more than anything else to form the mutes into a special class ; it intensifies the infirmity and makes them deafer and dumber, so to speak ; it isolates them from the hearing and speaking world, and gathers them together by themselves. We see these gatherings in all our large cities and towns.

That system which will scatter them among the hearing and speaking world ; which will make them self-reliant ; that aims at imparting the greatest amount of knowledge of *written* language in the shortest space of time ; that aims at fitting them for a hearing and speaking world—*that system I uphold.*

And such a system I find embodied in that recommended by our able and humane Board of State Charities. *Gentlemen, depend upon it, it will work.* In this Board, most happily, is the good physician who has overcome the greater difficulty of deafness, dumbness and blindness combined in Laura Bridgman. To him may we not safely intrust the education of these children ? The man who has succeeded so grandly with Laura *is the man, I say, to engineer the education of our deaf-mutes.* But for him, Hartford would be now refusing admission to children under twelve. He insisted upon *early* education, which Hartford stoutly opposed as “injudicious,” but rather than lose our beneficiaries, she finally consented to the arrangement to admit them at a younger age.

I was nine years old in 1841, and my father, unwilling to wait till I should become admissible under the rules of the Asylum and the laws of the State, framed in accordance therewith, went before the Legislature and obtained for me a special act of admission. (Resolves of 1841, Chapter 45.)

Here on the subject of early education Dr. Howe was right. Again, to Dr. H. the same mutes of New England owe a debt of gratitude. He insisted on teaching articulation in certain cases. Hartford sneered at the proposal, but finally yielded to the pressure brought to bear upon her, and what power of articulation many of us now possess, *we owe it to Dr. Howe.* It was not till Dr. H. agitated the subject in 1844 or 1845, that any care was taken of my speech, but even then that care was *reluctantly and imperfectly given.* It is of incalculable benefit to me now, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Rice will tell you how useful it is. I don't know that I could hold my position in his office but for my ability to speak. But the first three or four years of my term at Hartford were spent without any effort to reclaim it. I could sing very prettily when I entered, but for want of cultivation I was soon beyond rescue. *Here again on the subject of articulation Dr. Howe was right.* The Board of State Charities propose that Massachusetts have a school that will take the lead of all others by adopting all that is good in their system, and avoiding that which is evil. Massachusetts has certainly children enough to form a good school, and with Dr. H. to guide and direct, all would work like a charm. I have been struck with his keen penetration, his thorough understanding and knowledge of all that pertains to the wants and the education of the deaf and dumb ; and this is one reason why I do not, cannot accept the doctrine which Hartford maintains, or indirectly maintains, that no one outside the walls of the Asylum knows anything on the subject of deaf-mute education.

His keen penetration has enabled him to paint a true and perfect picture of the Asylum. I appeal to my friend, Mr. Bartlett, if he ever saw a truer picture painted than by Dr. H. on pages 1 and 2 of the "Defence." I have not.

"If you are so opposed to the use of signs as you profess to be, why do you yourself use them?" I have been asked. I reply, that to use them is a bad practice; all chewers of the weed, all moderate and immoderate drinkers, admit their habits to be bad, but the habit has become strong in them, and while they must indulge themselves, *they caution others not to follow in their footsteps.* This is just my position. I must talk by signs to my fellow-mutes, *by the very force of the habit*; but I would discard their use as far as possible with learners. I would have them taught MORE of written language, and let signs be one of the unknown tongues. I would have them abolished as far as possible. I would teach articulation where it is practicable, and omit it in cases which afford no hope of success. I would have the child trained to habits of self-reliance which he now so sadly lacks under his present treatment. *I favor therefore a day school to which the children can go, as proposed by the Board, and their boarding in families.* To raise the question which Mr. Stone raises (p. 32 of his Report,) "In what community could such an arrangement be effected?" is to distrust Christianity itself. "The poor ye have always with you," and surely many, yes, many communities can be found where the arrangement could be made, and without mercenary motives on the part of the people, for here in Massachusetts, with our sterile soil, we cannot do much in an agricultural way, and so we take to building churches and school-houses and raising men.

But Mr. Stone compliments Massachusetts by saying that in *most instances the interest felt in them by her people would be only mercenary!* I have several instances in my mind where deaf-mutes have attained a high state of culture without going to the Asylum, *upon the system recommended by Dr. Howe.*

And I know several instances of uneducated mutes who fare better than many of the educated, who talk as fluently by signs as if they had seen the schools, (but these signs they had learned from the educated.)

I have seen several Germans, highly educated, who knew no signs at all.

If an armless shoemaker in Cincinnati can do the finest quality of sewed work with his toes; if Laura Bridgman has been educated without the aid of signs, how much easier can the deaf-mute be brought up and educated on the simple plan proposed. *Where there is a will, there is a way.*

One of the most accomplished mutes in the country remarked to me, not long since, that the system of instruction was so defective and so unsatisfactory and often so unfortunate in its results, that he sometimes thought it might have been better if no schools at all had ever been formed for them, so many of the graduates would have been so much better off uneducated.

But while the Hartford School has done much good—I would not take one laurel from her brow—*this much I must say, it has not done enough.* That Massachusetts should have a school of her own, with an improved system of instruction, *is my deep, matured conviction.*

Like the Governor, I cannot concur either in the policy of expatriation. In behalf of the deaf-mutes of Massachusetts I thank him and the Board of State Charities for their deep interest in the welfare of these children, and their endeavor to secure for them a better school.

Let one broad step be taken by our glorious old Commonwealth towards the advancement of these her unfortunate wards. The call for a proper education for them is loud and pressing. The investment will be found a good one, one that will more than recompense for all labor and outlay of money.

WM. K. CHASE'S ADDRESS.

Chairman, and the Honorable Members of the Special Committee :—Having recently considered seriously whether I should declare my advocacy of the new said school or not, as I used to be a sincere friend of the old monopoly, till the other day, at last I came to an conclusion in favor of the new cause. I would say to my numerous friends at Hartford that I love them and my old home indeed, and with great pleasure remember their kind care and treatment during my pupilage; but being a native of Massachusetts, and desiring to see my future brothers and sisters better educated, was what I decided to declare, and sincerely hope that they will not think hard of me. I am not an able writer, and you will excuse the poor language accordingly, but I will try to give you some good reasons for advocating the new school.

The other day I happened to get Dr. Howe's pamphlet on Deaf-Mute Education, &c., and after getting through it carefully, I found out that I had used to misrepresent his views grossly, and now should say that I could not oppose the liberal and beneficial plan any further, and it was too good to be abused. But only I doubted the practicability of boarding the pupils outside of the school-house, but was soon satisfied that it was only intended to be an experiment, and then, in case of its impracticability, the institution in the last resort. That all enough.

I assure you that I have not got any complaint against the Asylum, for all the old complaints against it have since been corrected, and we think highly of Rev. Mr. Stone's (the new principal) management and impartiality to all, and so all the teachers have since been faithful to their duties. But it is uncertain whether his successor will be equally excellent, for he and his best teachers grow aged, and may be gone soon. If, when the new principal should prove indulgent, the teachers would attend to their duties unfaithfully. But if there should be another school in New England, the opposition would certainly be very beneficial to the deaf-mute education, and maintain the best management in both schools. Therefore the Asylum would be well patronized always, as with the increase of population there will be an increase of deaf-mutes.

As we understand, they at Hartford tell that if we should withdraw our beneficiaries from the Asylum, the vacant places would soon be filled with the others of the other States, who have failed to apply for admission. It would be strange to say that they are most partial to Massachusetts; and, therefore, we ought not to be selfish to keep our large part of the Asylum so as to drive the others away, when we can afford to establish another school for our exclusive use. We understand that there are several liberal offers to help building the said school in this State, and it would now be a good opportunity of starting with the enterprise at a less expense to the State.

No doubt the Asylum will not suffer from the loss of patronage from Massachusetts, if by the said removal, because the Asylum has the largest fund in the Union for the purpose of self-sustaining as well as helping those who may send their children at the possibly low terms. It may be supposed that they

only want to maintain the monopoly in spite of the loss of a good deal of their own fund to add to our patronage for each pupil's tuition.

The American Asylum is an excellent and independent boarding-school, affording every facility for parental protection and instruction of the deaf-mutes. But it is only the question whether its method of instruction is sufficiently beneficial and skilfully altered according to the progress of outside civilization or not. I am compelled to say that that system of instruction is purely old-fashioned, and we cannot control the Asylum in regard to the system, or persuade them to judge and adopt the suggestions whenever we may get good ideas.

We would suggest that they never should employ any green teacher in any class, as it would progress badly, or not get in a fair progress before some considerable time. Cheap prizes of some grades at frequent intervals in all classes, as books, money, fruits, &c., would be important, for they would encourage a great progress in education certainly, and also medals at the annual examination, as in our public schools. The teachers should also teach the endurance and kindness of those who get ahead in lessons, to help the other mutes in a good average of progress, because without the mutual benefit, it would discourage those who are backward, and the teachers can't do much without the said assistance. It is a fact that a poor teacher corresponds with a poor class. We trust that they would cheerfully adopt these slight suggestions.

We feel sorry to say that we have not seen any intelligent new Massachusetts graduate some years. Whose fault is it? I am of opinion that Massachusetts is more to blame than the Asylum. Because their term of education was shamefully reduced from eight years to six years during the war, for the sake of *economy* in the appropriations, and you will see that thirty have recently failed to apply for admission to the Asylum, owing to the limited appropriation! It seems to be the meanest appropriation in proportion to the other State charities. Two years ago we petitioned to the Legislature in behalf of our suffering children at Hartford for their longer terms, and unlimited number of admissible applicants, but the petition was soon withdrawn on leave! It was reported that it was through their opposition at Hartford, but I sincerely believe that it was contradicted.

New York and New Jersey's terms of deaf-mute education are uniformly ten years; Connecticut's eight. Generous! Massachusetts need not boast of her best school system, unless she should do our own people justice. We would say that Massachusetts' term at Hartford should be uniformly eight years, for that liberal term would turn many, if not all, bright and useful graduates; and the present term (six years) would prove a waste appropriation, as they come home too small adults, and many, especially in the country, would return to ignorance gradually. And also four years more, beside the Hartford term, at the new National College for the deaf-mutes at Washington, D. C., if they want to go, as some would need the further support from the State. That college has proved a great success, and its terms of admission about as low as those of the Asylum.

There are a good many semi-mutes at the Asylum, and we would suggest that they should give a more particular attention to their valuable cases, as myself, a semi-mute, indeed, but I had not got a sufficiently excellent instruction for articulation, and so I consider myself a perfect mute gradually. Lastly, in case of your decision to continue your patronage to the Asylum, we

would call your attention respectfully to the important point, in behalf of our suffering children at Hartford, in regard to their terms and also more liberal appropriations, so as to admit all the needy applicants. "Liberality is a true economy."

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Sanborn, have you visited the school at Chelmsford ?

Mr. SANBORN. I have visited the school at Chelmsford only once, and that was in November last. I spent an hour and a half or two hours in the school. I saw all the pupils present ; there were six only then. Among them were two who were said to have been (and there was every reason to suppose they were) born deaf ; the certificates of their parents were shown to me. One of them was a boy named Morse, who was under eight years of age ; and the other was a boy from Waltham. My first sight of this boy was in this way : I was sitting in the room where some of the classes are heard, talking with another of the pupils, and this lad and a companion of his came in to recite in arithmetic. I think I had not seen him before ; but certainly he had not seen me before. Soon after, I got up to go across the room, and he observed, (as some people occasionally do of me,) "high, high, high man ;" and I think he spoke it as distinctly as I do now. I talked, I think, with every pupil in the school. Some of them had been there but six weeks. There was a little boy sent from Connecticut, (though born, I believe, in Massachusetts,) who had lost his hearing at two years of age. He had learned to speak some words ; but, of course, he could not talk very fluently. He had been under instruction about six weeks, and his manner of articulation was quite distinct, and his progress in his studies seemed to me to be quite remarkable. I heard him count the numbers. He never had counted before above sixty, and he would jump for joy as he would pronounce each number, say, seventy-five ; and I could understand it quite distinctly. There was a young man from Providence, named Roscoe Green, a boy who had lost his hearing at the age of seven, and who had never been to school at Hartford nor in any institution for the instruction of deaf-mutes, but simply, for a while after losing his hearing, in the public schools. This boy I talked with a good deal, and talked more rapidly ; he talked with a little foreign accent, and if I had not been told his nativity, I should have supposed that he was French. I had no occasion to ask him to repeat. He understood me from reading the lips. Those who had been instructed but a short time had more difficulty. When I spoke with moderate slowness, he would understand me.

Question. Could he talk when he came there ?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long had he been there ?

A. Perhaps three months.

Q. He had always talked with the outside world by articulation ?

A. Yes, sir.

There are always among the pupils at Hartford, pupils of this precise kind—pupils who have learned to articulate somewhat. And I should like to have the Committee compare this lad with lads who have been under instruction at Hartford for a considerable time, and they will undoubtedly find that at Hartford they lose their articulation, while this lad articulates with great ease, and so as to be distinctly understood. He reads the lips with sufficient ease to make a conversation with him not at all difficult. About a fortnight after I visited the school at Chelmsford, I visited the institution at Hartford, and made some inquiries. I visited the high class taught by Mr. Storrs, (one of the teachers of the Hartford Asylum,) who I understand is the author of a pamphlet which I dare say has been submitted to the Committee. If that is so, his pamphlet would have gained weight by the addition of his name, because he is a teacher of great intelligence, and understands the subject which he is investigating. In this high class of Mr. Storrs, I think there were six pupils (I would not be positive) who had lost their hearing after birth. There were certainly five, and that would be more than half of the class. One of them had lost his hearing at the age of twelve, if I remember correctly, and another at the age of perhaps eight. I endeavored to talk with these children, and I did talk, I think, with all but one of them. That one, I found it impossible to understand, and it was impossible for him to understand me. In no case I thought there was a lack of brightness, as there is with some children, and I could only attribute the difference in their speech to the fact that very little attention was paid to their articulation, while, in the case of the pupils of Miss Rogers, great attention is paid to this, and, as I think, with very important results.

With reference to the remark of Mr. Turner, that in 1825 and up to 1830 the subject of articulation had not been much attended to, I think I ought to say that the first educated deaf-mutes of whom we have any account were taught by this method. This was done in Spain about three hundred years ago, and all through the following century. The teaching of articulation was pretty firmly established in Germany at that time. I could give the Committee, if necessary, the names of half a dozen teachers in Germany, who, as early as 1750, taught articulation with great success; but the greatest success, perhaps, on record, is that of a Spanish Jew named Pereire, who opened a small school in Paris and taught articulation almost exclusively; and, according to the evidence of scientific men at that time, among whom were Buffon and

the Abbé de l'Epée himself, the articulation was very successful. The pupils were taught so well that they not only talked the French language, but they spoke it in the manner in which their teacher had learned it, he having learned the Gascon dialect. This is noticed by several writers. In 1778, a school for the teaching of deaf-mutes was established in Saxony; so that however little was known in this country of articulation, it was known to be successful in several countries of Europe. I would like also to call the attention of the Committee to a case which has occurred in Massachusetts. I quote from the American Annals of the Deaf and Dumb, of March, 1861, which contains a notice of a book published in London in 1783, by Francis Green, a native of Massachusetts, who was born and died in Massachusetts. This book gives an account of the education of his son, who was also, I think, born in Massachusetts, and studied at the school of the Messrs. Braidwood, in Edinburgh. He gives here a long and particular account of his early education. This same paper contains translations by Francis Green, from the writings of the Abbé de l'Epée, published in the "New England Palladium," some years before the Hartford Asylum was established. In these letters, written about 1782, reference was made to one or two things which I would like to bring before the Committee. The Abbé de l'Epée says:—

"To instruct the deaf and dumb how to dispose of their organs in order to express sounds and to form distinct words, is an operation which most certainly is *neither long nor painful*. Three or four lessons do greatly advance this business, if not accomplish it fully, (by following the method of Mr. Bonnet, a Spaniard, printed an hundred and fifty years ago.) The business is nothing more than to make them acquire the practice of it; and that does not regard me. That is the affair of the persons who dwell with them, or of a common master who teaches children to read." . . .

"It is greatly to be desired, my dear friend, that the almost universal prejudice of the instruction of the deaf and dumb being an extremely difficult operation, should be done away. To entertain the public with such an idea would be, on my part, mere quackery. The work is *extraordinary*, I grant, but it is *not difficult*. On coming to my house to be present at our lessons, every one expects to see there some happy invention, which is an effort of art, in order to facilitate language and develop the understandings of my pupils, but they only find a *very simple method*, which is apprehended in an instant, and of which one conceives immediately the infallible connection with success. I presume to call to witness the princes of the blood, dukes and other noblemen, ambassadors from foreign courts, magistrates, ecclesiastics, and other persons of every denomination and condition, who have honored (with their presence) some of our lessons. *Patience*, attended with a great deal of *mildness*, is the principal talent necessary for the matter; by the addition thereto of *order* in their ideas, and a small degree of *imagination*, nothing else is wanting."

The first passage relates expressly to the teaching of articulation, and the second notices the language of signs which De l'Épée finally adopted.

Charles Green was placed at Messrs. Braidwoods' in 1780, and he was removed from there in 1783, I think. The following extract from Mr. Green's book will show what was the mode of his instruction:—

“My visit to him was in May, 1781. It exceeds the power of words to convey any idea of the sensations experienced at this interview. The child, ambitious to manifest his acquisition, eagerly advanced, and addressed me with a distinct salutation of speech. He also made several inquiries in short sentences. I then delivered him a letter from his sister, (couched in the simplest terms,) which he read so as to be understood. He accompanied many of the words, as he pronounced them, with proper gestures, significative of their meaning, such as in the sentence, ‘write a letter by papa;’ on uttering the *first* word, he described the action of writing by a motion of his right hand; the *second*, by tapping the letter he held; the third by pointing to me. He could at that time repeat the Lord's Prayer very properly, and some other forms, one of which in particular (which I had never heard before) I then took down in writing from his repetition, a convincing proof of his speaking intelligibly. I found he could in a short time read distinctly, in a slow manner, any English book, although it cannot be supposed he had as yet learned the meaning of many words. He however made daily progress in that knowledge. As to writing, there can be no reason why deaf persons may not, by imitation, learn that art as well as any other persons; accordingly, I was not at all surprised that he could write very plainly; this, indeed, he did with uncommon readiness and dexterity, and seemed not a little proud of all his new attainments. I had also the satisfaction to see such specimens, at that time, in the proficiency of others who had been longer at this academy, as left no doubt in my mind of his acquiring, in due season, a perfect acquaintance with language, both oral and written; and that he would be capable of any art or science whatever, except music and oratory. Perfectly satisfied with his situation in a conscientious and respectable family, I left him to pursue his studies, with a degree of hope and joy, which, on this score I had never expected to have known. On my next visit in September, 1782, his improvements were very perceptible in speech, the construction of language, and in writing; he had made a good beginning in arithmetic, and surprising progress in the arts of drawing and painting. I found him capable of not only comparing ideas, and drawing inferences, but expressing his sentiments with judgment. On my desiring him to attempt something he thought himself unequal to, I set him the example by doing it myself; upon which, he shook his head, and with a smile, replied (distinctly, *viva voce*,) ‘You are a man, sir, I am a boy.’ Observing that he was inclined in company to converse with one of his school-fellows, by the tacit finger language, I asked him why he did not speak to him with his mouth? To this his answer was as pertinent as it was concise: ‘He is deaf.’ Many other instances I could mention of expressions of the mind, as proper as could be made by any boy of his age, who had not the disadvantage of deafness.”—*Vox Oculis Subjecta*, pp. 149–53.

Dr. HOWE. Some remarks in Mr. Smith's evidence seem to justify me in saying what I should not otherwise have said, and what, perhaps, it would not have been proper for me to say; indeed, I do not know but it may have been a misuse of language. It seemed to be implied in some way that I was to be connected with the instruction of mutes, and that this was a matter to be confided to me. I never entertained such an idea, and could not give my attention to it in any way, for I am so situated that I could not by any circumstances be drawn into taking any active part in it. I have no idea of acting even as trustee in such an establishment.

Mr. SANBORN. I ought to have stated in regard to the passage in Mr. Chase's letter in relation to contributions, that I consider myself authorized to say, although I have not talked with the gentleman, that there is a gentleman in this State who is ready to give within the present year the sum of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000,) if that is necessary, to establish a school for deaf-mutes in Massachusetts. I have no doubt that there are others: indeed, I have heard of another person who proposes to do a similar thing at some future time. But this, as I understand, is an offer now made and worthy of the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. Turner stated that he desired to call the attention of the Committee to the case of Mr. Chamberlain, who was admitted to the school at Hartford in 1844, at the age of twelve years.

Mr. Chamberlain, a deaf person, was then questioned by Mr. Turner, the questions being read from the lips by Mr. C., and responded to with only an occasional indistinctness of utterance.

Question. (By Mr. TURNER.) When did you become deaf?

Answer. When I was five years old.

Q. How long were you at school?

A. Four years.

Q. Who were your teachers?

A. Mr. —, Mr. Storrs, Mr. —, and yourself.

Q. Could you read before you lost your hearing?

A. Yes, I could.

Q. And could you write also?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you hear anything I say?

A. Nothing at all.

Q. Are you deaf?

A. You would think so if you were in my shoes.

Q. Can you hear it thunder?

A. If it is heavy enough, I can feel the jar.

Q. You are the editor of a paper. What is the name of your paper?

A. The "National Deaf-Mute Gazette."

Q. Was Amos Smith in your class?

A. Yes; he and I were classmates for three years.

Q. How old are you?

A. Thirty-four.

Mr. TURNER. During the ten years that I was principal of the institution, I employed a teacher in articulation whose sole business it was to teach these semi-mutes. We never attempted anything further with congenital mutes, but these semi-mutes were taught at regular hours each day.

Question. Is Mr. Chamberlain a singular case?

Mr. TURNER. We have a number as good as he.

Q. Are semi-mutes taught in Hartford now?

Mr. TURNER. They teach them now the same as I did.

Q. Is not this the result of long practice?

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir; it is an effort requiring long practice, and requiring special skill on the part of the teachers.

Adjourned to the 31st inst., at 9½, A. M.

SECOND HEARING.

THURSDAY, January 31.

The Committee met at half past nine o'clock, and the hearing of evidence was continued. Dr. HOWE read the petition of George Homer and others, deaf-mutes, which was afterwards presented to the Legislature, in favor of the recommendation of the Governor.

Dr. HOWE then addressed the Committee as follows :

I will take the liberty, in opening, to read from the proofs of the Report of the Board of State Charities, which is now in press, but will probably not be submitted to the Legislature in time to be read by this Committee before making their report. The passages I am about to read have been agreed upon by the Board, and express substantially, I may say entirely, the views of the Board of State Charities :—

The Blind, the Deaf-Mutes, and the Idiots.—There is every reason to believe that the number of children of the above named classes, who ought to be educated, is larger than the number actually in the schools for the purpose. Until the tables of the Census of 1865 are completed, we can hardly judge what the true number of these children is, but there are several facts to show that the instruction of all is not now provided for. We know that the existing schools are always full, and often have many applicants on the list. This is the case, for example, with our deaf and dumb children. There are always several names on the State list of children who must wait till their turn comes to be received at Hartford, to say nothing of those too young to go, and waiting to reach the age of eight years, when they can begin to be taught there.

We deem it advisable that measures should be taken to ascertain, as nearly as possible, the number, residence, age and condition of such children, as the first step toward improving their education. This information can probably be collected by our Board, if that is judged best.

In our Second Annual Report we sketched the outlines of a plan by which the deaf-mute children of Massachusetts, who, if taught at all, are now sent to an adjoining State, can be kept at home, and instructed by methods equally good, and, perhaps, superior. We would not insist on the details, but the general plan we would now reiterate, and would urge that something like it should be adopted. We believe that His Excellency the Governor, in recommending, as he did in his Annual Message, the instruction of these children within the State, only expressed the general sentiment of our people. We do not understand him as desiring the removal of the pupils now at Hartford, unless that is sought by their parents, but as suggesting that provision should be made for teaching future applicants in one or more schools in Massachusetts. And we have good authority for believing that benevolent persons stand ready to endow largely any such school that may be established by the Legislature.

It seems, indeed, natural that if the Commonwealth should countenance any place for an Asylum within her own borders, it would stimulate the benevolence of her citizens to do for the mutes what McLean did for the insane, and Perkins for the blind.

There are three considerations which should have great weight in deciding this question.

First, these unfortunates are, for the time, wards of the Commonwealth; and, other things being equal, she should commit them to the charge of her own citizens rather than to others; she should keep them at home rather than send them abroad. In the words of the Governor, "As ours is the responsibility, be ours, also, the grateful labor. To no other object of philanthropy will the warm heart of Massachusetts respond more promptly." It is well known to those conversant with the subject, that great and important changes in the mode of instructing mutes have been earnestly advocated by some of the ablest teachers in Europe, and that the Governments of France and of Russia have taken measures to test the value of these by actual practice. Massachusetts may become ever so well convinced that these changes are desirable, but she has no power at present to try them in practice, for she has no right to prescribe the method of instruction at the Asylum in Hartford.

Second, any undue aggregation of persons suffering a common infirmity is unwise, because, while it intensifies the unfavorable peculiarities growing out of their infirmity, it lessens the corrective influence of associating with ordinary persons. Schools, therefore, for the infirm or defective, especially boarding schools, should be no larger than is necessary. This principle can hardly be insisted upon too strongly. Massachusetts now sends a hundred mute children to the Hartford Asylum, and if the school were nearer the centre of our population, the number would probably reach a hundred and fifty, which is even more than is necessary for all purposes of classification. This subject was fully discussed in our last year's Report, and it is hardly necessary for us to say here, that we do not desire to build up a large and costly institution for the deaf-mutes of Massachusetts, but to see them distributed in several schools, to which pupils younger than are now received at Hartford could be sent.

Third, the chief end of the special instruction of mutes is to teach language, from learning which, in the natural way, they are precluded by their infirmity. Now, like other children, they are best adapted for this during the tender years of early childhood. Every year after a certain age, which is quickly reached, the facility for learning language lessens. But the reluctance of parents to send mutes from home during childhood is very great, and their reluctance naturally increases in proportion to the distance of the school.

If, as has been suggested, there were several small schools for such children in different parts of the State, and one central finishing school, in which the higher branches of learning and the trades could be taught, it might meet the wants of this interesting class in the best manner, with least interruption of those family and social relations which are even more important for them than for ordinary children.

These are the recommendations of the Board of State Charities in their forthcoming report. I will now, with your permission, make a few remarks upon these several points.

First, the fact that these children are wards of the Commonwealth. This is a most important relation. The State has towards these children certain duties and obligations. The State should have these children placed in such conditions and under such regulations, as that she can direct, if need be, any change that may be desirable in their course of instruction. She should have the means of easy and frequent examination. They should be so placed that trustees or others appointed by the State can see them as the trustees see our insane asylums, our school for the blind, our State almshouses, to which the trustees go at any moment they choose—and they go very frequently to most of these institutions. No one knows better than yourself, Mr. Chairman, the frequency with which some of these institutions are visited, and how constantly some one of the trustees has his eye upon the daily routine, if I may say so, in those institutions. Why are the wards of the Commonwealth, unable to speak for themselves, sent abroad, entirely beyond our control, and almost entirely beyond our inspection? For I would ask gentlemen familiar with the proceedings of Committees of the Legislature, whether it has ever been, or whether it can well be possible, for our deaf-mutes to be under such strict inspection as our blind children, for instance, are? What is the course, usually? A Committee on Public Charities is appointed by the Legislature, composed of gentlemen selected without any special view to their preparation for or interest in this matter. They make one annual visit to the institution at Hartford, there is a sort of an exhibition, and they come home exceedingly gratified, make a report, and there is an end of it. The Governor and Council go once a year, and they make a general inspection and a general report, and there is an end of that. The Board of State Charities go once a year,—some of their members oftener,—and they make an inspection,—a general inspection, of course, occupying perhaps an hour or two,—and they go away. There are three formal visits during the year. It may be said that more can be made. That is very true; but these children ought to be so placed as to invite inspection—so that it shall be perfectly easy and pleasant to go and see them, without being obliged to travel to another State. I have felt, even when I have visited that institution officially, that I was there by the courtesy of the gentlemen who presided over it; and they are courteous gentlemen, and always give us all the facilities we desire. But still, as an officer of the Board of State Charities, I have felt very differently, in going to that institution, from what I feel when I visit the institution at Monson or Westborough, or anywhere else. If I see anything in the discipline or general management at Monson or Westborough, that I think can be improved, I take the liberty to make the suggestion, and I think I keep myself pretty well acquainted with

them. But at Hartford, I feel that I am there as a guest. At Hartford, I have seen things (and I speak now, not as a member of the Board of State Charities, but in my individual capacity) in their course of education which it seemed to me would be changed in a fortnight, if in Massachusetts, for the better. I would like to ask the Principal if the girls in that institution are accustomed to do much domestic work? Do they make their own beds?

MR. STONE. Yes, sir.

DR. HOWE. How much of the house-work do they do?

MR. STONE. They wash the dishes, sweep the rooms, and make the beds. They make their own beds, not the boys'.

DR. HOWE. Who makes the beds of the boys?

MR. STONE. The servants.

DR. HOWE. That is one instance. Here are 135 beds to be made, and here are some hundred girls, most of whom, at home, are brought up to work. I would like to have them all brought up to work. To instance my own institution. Our children are blind, but we think that is a reason why they should be taught to make beds. I would ask if, at the asylum at Hartford, the boys saw the wood?

MR. STONE. We burn coal.

DR. HOWE. You use some wood?

MR. STONE. Very little, sir.

DR. HOWE. Do the boys sift the coal?

MR. STONE. They assist in it.

DR. HOWE. Do they do the most of the work?

MR. STONE. No, sir. They are all occupied in the shops. The boys over twelve years old are occupied in the shops in learning trades.

DR. HOWE. That is one of the things which I think, according to our system of managing institutions in Massachusetts, the inmates should be trained to do. They should saw and split the wood, sift the coal, and do everything of that kind that can be done. They come mostly from a class of people who are accustomed to labor; they are going back to a class of people who are accustomed to labor; and those of them who have been so unfortunate as to have been brought up in families where they did not have to labor, ought to be taught to work somewhere. I speak of this as one of the things which struck me at Hartford. There are children supported by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, paid for at the rate of \$175 a year, and really costing \$250 to somebody, some of them girls from twelve to sixteen, having hired persons come to do the domestic work. I do not see why the pupils in an institution of that kind—strong, hearty young persons—should not do as they do in manual-labor schools, work enough to pay their own way; or why the institution should not be conducted in such

a manner as to give these children every facility and all possible dexterity in the performance of manual labor. It is a common complaint with persons in the country who have to do with deaf-mute children, that they do not seem to be "handy"—do not seem to know how to do common things. They cannot do the chores about a farm, for instance. They can read and write and cipher—they have been well taught and are under good discipline in those respects—but have not been trained to do ordinary work as they ought to have been. That is one of the things which I think would be very soon rectified in Massachusetts.

Then, among the advantages of home education, would be this: that we should bring the institution for deaf-mutes within the category of all the other State institutions. That is, being here at home, it would be carried on by Massachusetts people, according to Massachusetts ideas, under the inspection of our officers, and, moreover, train up men and women to this work at home. I think that one of the most beautiful effects of the great number of charitable institutions in Massachusetts is the constant training up of a large number of intelligent, moral and worthy men and women in the offices of charity and love which are there performed. Our hospitals, our almshouses, our reform schools, altogether employ, perhaps, from four to five hundred persons, trained for a time in these offices, then going back among our own citizens, and carrying with them the spirit which they imbibe in these establishments. I wish it was the same with regard to the school for deaf-mutes. I cannot help thinking that one of the reasons why it is regarded as such a mysterious, hard and difficult matter to teach these unfortunate persons, is because we have nobody in Massachusetts, except those few persons who have happened by chance to be drawn into this matter, at all familiar with it; and I wish, for our own sakes, that we had the advantage of as many accomplished and able teachers as they have at Hartford. It is, as I said, regarded as a peculiar and difficult art; and yet, as I had the honor to say to you the other day, the most difficult parts of this branch of instruction can be performed by persons who are drawn to it by an intense zeal and interest in the matter, as well as by those persons to whom it has been the business of their lives, and whom we are accustomed to look upon somewhat in the light of mysterious personages—as men possessing an art which nobody else understands.

In this connection, I should like to read to you an extract from a letter which is to me, and I suppose it will be to you, a most interesting one, sent to me a few weeks ago by a friend, who wrote me: "I see you are interested in this matter, and I send you a letter which I received from a relative of mine in Ledyard, Conn." I never heard of the person before, but this lady told me that he was an uneducated man, as you will see by his letter, who had taught his deaf-mute son to

talk ; and you will see the account he gives of teaching another person to talk. This letter illustrates what was said the other day about the simplicity of this whole matter, if it can only be brought down to the comprehension of ordinary persons, who have a natural aptness to teach, and natural zeal in teaching :—

“The fourth day of last December a man came to my house, bringing with him a deaf son, wishing me to make a trial with him, to see whether I could teach him to talk as I had my son Enoch. I never had seen him but once before. Two years previous we were called on by this man to butcher a hog, Enoch being with me ; and he, seeing that his son could hear quite as well as Enoch, and yet was a mute, it set him to thinking, and he thought upon it for two years, and then came with his son. I kept him 105 days, and in this time he made so much of an improvement that he could call off the alphabet in a perfect manner, could say almost any word quite plain—could spell many words, such as house, barn, tree, rock, stone, &c., &c. He was 21 years old the 15th of last February. It is my candid conviction that there are but very few of the deaf who could not be taught to talk, if they were properly managed with. I have found but very few mutes who can hear *none* ; almost all of them can hear *some*. All of us who reflect at all upon the subject, know that every deaf person or child has the same organs for talking that those who hear have, and the only reason why they do not use them with the same success is because they don't know how. Now, this is the whole difficulty—*they don't know how*. Now, we all know that every letter, and every word that is spoken, and spoken *plain*, takes the *same* operation of the mouth and lips. Now, this is the question : Cannot the deaf be taught this art of using their mouth and lips as people who talk do ? I think the most of them can, only commence with them at a suitable age, and manage with them in a proper manner. There might be some few of them, who could hear *none at all* and who were stupid and dull, that could not be taught to talk. This young man that has been with me could hear some, but not enough to learn to talk. He could convey nothing by language, as he was master of none. He did not ask to *hear*, but ‘I want to see the mouth’ he would say ; but when he came to my house he did not know that he had a mouth, (by name,) or a head, eye, nose, or any other member. It looks to me like a great pity that this way of teaching the deaf could not have a fair trial. When this young man left me he could (by observing my mouth,) read off the whole alphabet, let me commence wherever I might, and skip about wherever I might, not missing a single letter ; and it was the same with any word he had learned—only mouth it out, not making *ANY* noise, and he would know it just as soon as any person knows by hearing.

“Now, my son Enoch don't think of *hearing* people when they talk, but depends on *seeing* their mouths ; but, since men have worn their beard on their upper lip, he is somewhat pestered to understand them, not having a fair sight at their mouths.”

This recalls to my mind the fact, that, since I had the honor of addressing the Board, I have received some further communications with regard to the methods now used in Europe in simplifying and popularizing this branch of instruction, and I am firmly convinced that

they are in Europe on the eve of a great change in regard to this matter ; that it is to be taken, partly, at least, out of the hands of mere experts, and thrown, in a great many cases, into the common schools. In this matter, however, I would state that I stand alone, at least, so far as the members of the Board are concerned. The Board of State Charities are not committed to any mode of instruction whatever, simply urging a removal of the deaf-mutes home to this State.

I would like to make a few remarks, also, on the size of the institution. I think that all persons who are familiar with large boarding-schools for girls or for boys, must be aware that there are very great disadvantages attending those boarding-schools. First, there are the positive disadvantages. We all know them, and I need not go into that. Secondly, there are very great privations attending them ; that is to say, children are, during that period of life when they are most impressionable, when their character is in a state of formation, still plastic, taken away from home during the most important period of their lives. A link is stricken out of the chain of associations which binds them to home ; they lose the influence of home discipline, of the affections of home, of the formation of early friendships with the children of neighboring families ; and, altogether, the effect is so unfavorable, that wise people are exceedingly reluctant to send their children away from home to be herded together in large boarding-schools. That I hold to be true with regard to all children. With regard to deaf-mutes and the blind, the unfavorable effect is very much greater, because, in the first place, say what we may about abstractions and about theories, blindness or deafness, or any infirmity of this kind, does have an unfavorable effect on the whole character. There can be no doubt about it, else God gave us these senses without object. Certain effects grow out of these infirmities which are undesirable ; and the main object in the education of these children, taken as a class, should be to counteract the effect of this infirmity ; to prevent it having any influence on the character ; to make them just as much as possible like other children ; and that is what, of all things, they most desire. Take any sensitive blind person, take any sensitive deaf-mute, and you will find that the first thing they desire is that they may no longer be considered as belonging to a class apart ; that they may be like us in all their surroundings and in all their relations with other men, and not be, as it were, segregated from the rest of society and put in a class apart. This shows the instinctive action of their minds—resisting, as it were, this false position in which we place them. God distributes them in the community, in families, here and there. We do not find them growing up in one town together ; we do not find them growing up in one imme-

diate neighborhood ; we find them scattered abroad, and thus the weight of the infirmity is lessened.

Now I hold that the larger the aggregation of numbers, the more considerable are these unfavorable effects ; and I hold that the more completely and closely you associate a blind child or a deaf and dumb child with persons who have not the same infirmity, the better for him. We want to train such a child to associate and live with ordinary persons. How shall we do it ? By associating him with persons who have the same infirmity that he has, or by associating him with other persons ? The answer is perfectly clear and plain. With deaf-mutes this is especially true, because, by their infirmity, they have less intimate social relations with ordinary persons than the blind. The social relations between the blind and the community, generally are not lessened by their privation ; on the contrary, perhaps they are increased ; with the deaf-mute they are lessened. He is to grow up a young man in our community, and we want, if possible, that his friends, his playmates, those with whom he is forming relations that are to exist through life, shall be talking persons, and not deaf-mutes.

Now, as I had the honor of saying the other day, after we have arrived at a certain period, we must sacrifice something for the purposes of education. Granted that you must send these children somewhere to be taught together ; but let it be in as small numbers as possible, and let it be for the least time possible. It is the same thing with regard to children laboring under any peculiarity—with regard to the children who are of the class we call juvenile delinquents. Here is a boy whose father is a thief and a vagabond, and his grandfather, perhaps, before him. He is born with a tendency to crime. Associate that boy with four or five hundred children in a House of Reformation, and let him stay there six or eight years, and there is not so much chance for that boy as there would be if you put him in a family in the country, with other boys and girls, who have none of these inherited tendencies and none of these vicious habits in life ; you entirely master these tendencies by bringing this wholesome influence to bear upon him. It is upon this principle that I always discountenance the aggregation together in communities of any persons who have any special infirmity, whether it be physical or moral. In the first place, the aggregation of the young together in large boarding-schools, separating them from the ordinary home and social influences, is bad ; and, in the second place, the effects of this are all intensified when the child is the subject of any peculiar infirmity, bodily or mental. I hold that the institution at Hartford is already too large. If it were my lot to have a deaf and dumb child, and there was an institution in my neighborhood with two hundred and fifty or three hundred children, and another establishment, equally good in

all respects, and no better, but one hundred miles off, with fifty or one hundred children, I would send him to the farthest one as the least evil.

Then there is the matter of early education, and that, I think, a most important one. You all know, gentlemen, that your children, by the time they are six or eight years old, talk English about as well as you do, and that they have learned it without any labor. They have learned it solely because at that time of life the faculties are in a condition to act, as it were, spontaneously, without any effort, without any study. A child learns language just as he drinks water. It comes almost instinctively. Afterwards, it is a hard, dry, difficult, almost impossible work; and every year that passes after a child is six years old, that difficulty increases. I have seen children in the island of Malta, eight years old, speaking four languages without any trouble, and without mixing them up together, solely from the condition in which they were placed,—the father speaking one language, the mother another, and the child learning a third in school and a fourth in the streets. Now, the great end and aim of the institution at Hartford, as they will tell you, is to give the children a knowledge of language. That is to say, they begin with them now at eight years old. There was the greatest difficulty in bringing about a reform in this respect, which would have been accomplished in Massachusetts twenty-five years ago; but finally the age at which children should be received was reduced from twelve to eight. Now they cannot go there until they are eight years old. At eight years old, they have lost four years which are more valuable, I will venture to say, in the acquisition of language, than any eight years of subsequent life. Deaf-mute children should be taught first as soon as they arrive at the age when, if they could hear, they would speak; and, at the age of four years, they are capable of beginning to learn language with very great advantage. Four years, therefore,—the four most precious years,—are necessarily lost. Perhaps, under any circumstances, there must be some loss; for we find it exceedingly difficult in practice to persuade the parents of deaf-mute children, who are eight, nine, or ten years old, to send them to Hartford. "It is away off in another State," they say, "and we do not know about it. We do not like to send our poor little boy or little girl so far away, among strangers." All these difficulties are very much increased by the distance, and especially with regard to little children.

With reference to the mode of instruction at Hartford, I have so long and so earnestly advocated a change in that respect, and that they should teach articulation,—and that it should be taught, too, not in compliance with outward pressure, but by persons who have a living faith in the method,—that perhaps it is not well for me to say anything more

on that subject, and I shall leave it to other gentleman who may follow me. I have taken up too much time already.

Mr. WRIGHT. Have you seen a pamphlet entitled "Remarks on the Theories of Dr. Samuel G. Howe respecting the Education of Deaf-Mutes," which has been laid before the Committee?

Dr. HOWE. I saw it at the last meeting of the Committee, but as the writer had not the courage to put his name to it, I thought it not worth paying any attention to.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to call your attention to some remarks on page 14. Although you have disclaimed all intention of having anything to do with an institution for the deaf and dumb, if one should be established in this State, yet I should like to have your opinion in regard to religious instruction at such an institution, provided the State should decide to have one here.

Dr. HOWE. The writer of this pamphlet says: "If we are correctly informed, no direct religious instruction is given them (the blind) in the institution under Dr. Howe's care." I do not know what that means. It would seem to imply that the blind have no direct religious instruction, and that they are not familiar with the facts of scripture history, &c. It is very strange to me that persons having any opportunity of knowing the truth should publish such a statement. By the regulations of our institution, no sectarian instruction can be given. The pupils, however, are all required to attend public worship twice every Sunday. They usually attend Sunday school, and are directed to do so. A large number, I will not say how many, precisely, because I am entirely unprepared for the question, but I should say certainly about one-half of the girls and nearly one-half of the boys, who are of an age to comprehend the importance of it, are members of churches. They select their own place of public worship, but are required to go there. At the institution, there has never been a day since its foundation, *not a day*, when religious services have not been performed there. I myself have had the pleasure, during thirty odd years, of reading the scriptures to the children, of joining with them in a prayer, and in singing a sacred Hymn. There may be omissions under other regulations of the institution, but the religious services are *never* omitted. Moreover, there, for the first time, the Bible was given to the blind in raised letters, and there they are taught daily to read it and to understand it, but with no sectarian bias whatever. We strictly abstain from that, and that is all. Our Catholics go to the Catholic church, the Baptists go to the Baptist church, and so on, and the clergymen and Sunday school teachers are encouraged to give them their views in regard to the matter.

That is all I have to say in answer to this statement. I do not pretend, myself, to be a religious man; I do not write "reverend" before

my name, having very little thought or care what clothes religion may put on. As long as a man is religious, he may clothe himself in whatever outward garments he chooses.

There is one statement in this pamphlet of which I think the writer, or any person having any knowledge of the writer, after reading my statement, ought simply to be ashamed. It is asserted here, in order to take away from Dr. Howe what little authority he may have in regard to matters touching the deaf-mutes, that he is constantly changing his views, and that he once advocated the establishment of a colony of deaf-mutes before the Legislature. That assertion was made in the pamphlet of the Principal of the Hartford School, without the slightest authority for it, and when it might have been ascertained here that it was untrue. In my reply, I published that contradiction. The author of this pamphlet, with my contradiction before him, reiterates the charge. It is no matter; of no sort of consequence. I have never expressed anything but respect for the Hartford School, but feel myself at liberty to criticize their mode of instruction or management.

Mr. SANBORN. I do not rise to make any remarks, because I think it is unfair to the gentlemen from Hartford, who have now given us their attendance for two days, that our speakers should take up the time, if they desire to be heard. I only wish to say, in support of the memorial of the deaf-mutes which has been presented this morning, that I have two communications, one from Mr. George Homer, who appeared before the Committee at the last hearing, and who, fearing his remarks were not fully understood by the Committee, has taken the pains to write out the views which he wishes to present, and desires me to read them, and the other, a communication from Mr. John Carlin, not a citizen of Massachusetts, not even, I believe, "a native of Massachusetts," but a very distinguished graduate of the Philadelphia deaf-mute school, who has received the degree of Master of Arts, and was invited by a convention of the instructors of the deaf and dumb to present a paper at one of their sessions, and did so, the paper being read, I think, by Mr. Stone. Mr. Carlin has had his attention called to this matter, I do not know in what way, and he has drawn up a paper, which he desires me to read. With the permission of the Committee, I will read these two papers.

COMMUNICATION FROM GEORGE HOMER.

Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Committee :—I am pleased with the report and recommendations of the Board of State Charities in relation to provision for the deaf-mutes of the State, and I concur in the suggestions of His Excellency Governor Bullock, that the initiatory steps be taken for a

school here in our own glorious old State. I have never been able to countenance expatriation.

I entered the Hartford Asylum in 1825, and graduated in 1831. My father and friends took much interest in the cultivation of my speech, but Mr. Gallaudet, the then Principal, although he knew I could articulate, made no attempt to preserve it. Down to 1845, when Dr. Howe compelled the Asylum to teach articulation, I believe it was not taught, and the cases where speech became entirely lost through want of care or cultivation have not been few.

I favored Dr. Howe in 1845, and I favor him now, because I believe he is right, and that he will demonstrate the correctness of his views.

At any rate, let Massachusetts carry out his suggestions. Let it be in the form of an experiment. *But, from my knowledge of deaf-mutes, I tell you it will succeed, which the advocates of the old system don't want to see done.*

The old omnibus proprietors opposed the introduction of horse-cars into this city. Their arguments against their introduction did indeed seem plausible; but who to-day would substitute the old coaches for the cars?

Mr. Field was ridiculed in his attempts to establish communication across the great deep. He has succeeded, and his opponents are dumb.

Everything is improving; the world moves; *but the system of instruction at Hartford has remained nearly the same for fifty years. Improvements are needed*, for it is notorious that the system in use does not turn out the right sort of scholars. *It adheres to an extensive use of signs, which is wrong.* Small schools are better than large ones.

Question propounded to me—"Do you think in signs or in words?"

Answer—In signs, I think.

(Signed)

GEO. HOMER.

COMMUNICATION FROM JOHN CARLIN.

Gentlemen :—The question now under your consideration, the necessity of a new institution for the deaf and dumb in Massachusetts, is of vital importance, and therefore demands wisdom and careful examination. Your main object is to improve the intellectual and moral condition of her mute children by the best and surest possible mode of education.

Thousands of deaf-mutes have been educated at all the institutions in this country. Here I must beg your attention to the fact that I myself am a deaf-mute, and have long moved in the midst of the mute community, ascertaining the extent of their capacity to express their ideas. That, since they are taught how to read and write, their education is complete in proportion with their limited terms of instruction, *I must with blunt candor deny.* True, there are many mutes who are remarkably well educated, and write with rapidity and grammatical accuracy; but it must be remarked that their superior attainments are attributed not to the boasted excellency of the system of instruction, but to the uncommon brightness of their minds, and their industry and diligence in study, more particularly *after their graduation.* It must be borne in mind that the number of such is by no means great. At the school hardly over five out of two hundred pupils are annually found familiar with the principles of the English grammar, and the rest are more or less deficient in written languages. This is a stubborn fact, and one indeed far beyond dispute. Now, it may be asked how this deficiency is caused, and I can safely answer, by *their excessive use of signs, always encouraged by their teachers*, who declare, no

doubt honestly, that the sign language is the deaf-mute's natural mode of communication. Your attention is again called to the following observation: The pantomimic language, generally employed in the school-room as well as in the sitting-room and elsewhere, is not a language of words in written order. It is simply a jargon of gestures, each gesture representing a word or action, and all the gestures are thrown together, utterly without regard to the grammatical order.

At school, bits of history and science are given *ad libitum* in attractive gestures. This course, in my opinion, is useless and often pernicious to the progress of the pupil's mind in spoken language. But the objection might be removed were dactylogy constantly employed, and *that even to excess*, (and there can be no excess,) with a few signs, if judged necessary, for the explanation of new words and phrases. The signs thus used should, by all means, be in written order.

Gentlemen, you ask if another better *modus operandi* could be devised and brought into successful operation in the school-room, and I answer, *Yes*. How? By enforcing on the pupil the use of digital spelling and writing on the slate, the use of mischievous signs being strictly prohibited, and by the repetition of his lessons till the grammatical rules are deeply impressed on his memory. You inquire whether this mode could be introduced into the old institutions, and I answer, *it could not*, because of their obstinate adherence to the old system. *Thereupon you will see the necessity of a new institution, with a new system.*

I have read with much interest Dr. Howe's pamphlet, and the reply by a Hartford Professor calling himself "a native of Massachusetts." As respects the chapel, where the Hartford Professor evidently insists on the use of signs in religious lectures, it seems proper to say that out of two hundred pupils sitting in the chapel, about ten are attentive to the lecture. Even in the face of his assertion, that "the joy and wonder of the mutes who come to the school ignorant even of the existence of a God, as the facts of Scripture history are unfolded to them, is most interesting to see," most of their faces always evince vacancy or stupidity of expression; and their feet—rather boots and shoes—make all manner of noise, as indicative of their suffering from sitting for two mortal hours, as they are annoying beyond endurance to the lecturer. That the three youngest classes can understand the subject of the lecture is preposterous. But religious instruction in the chapel is absolutely indispensable to their moral welfare. You ask, how can it be performed in a manner altogether different from that which is pursued at the old institutions? My answer is simple, and I hope you will be satisfied with its practicability. This is, the performance must be on the Sunday school plan; in other words, all the pupils, in accordance with their respective terms of instruction, should be arranged in classes similar to those of a speaking Sunday school; the catechism should be exercised on the fingers, and, if needful, a few appropriate signs might be employed in unfolding to their wondering minds the wondrous works of God and the lovely character of the Redeemer.

Judging from the past course of opinion demonstrated by the persons in charge of the old institutions, it is exceedingly doubtful that the old plan of chapel services can ever be altered or improved; *therefore the necessity of a new institution, with a totally new plan, will be obvious to all thinking minds.*

In establishing a new institution in your State, a State famous for her charitable institutions, the energy and wealth of her citizens, and the liberality of opinions of her statesmen, as the Hartford Professor truthfully avers, that if some one from Hartford were placed at the head, it would be essentially the Hartford institution over again, it will be improper to employ any teachers of the old institutions as your principal or assistant-teachers, unless they have sufficient nerve to pledge their honor that they shall abstain from the excessive use of signs.

I think the Hartford Professor, in treading on the pecuniary ground, has made *un faux pas*. After a somewhat eloquent exposition of the wealth of the Hartford Asylum and her generosity to New England, he betrayed his anxiety to secure the patronage of your State, by saying: "Continue your deaf-mute children with us so long, and only so long, as in your judgment you cannot do better elsewhere." I am confident that your intelligence, and desire to see all deaf-mutes better educated, without regard to cost, will not allow you to be misled by his arguments. The better educated the mute, the abler to move in society, and none the less ready he will be to transact business, that his State may be more than amply repaid in cash, the higher taxes he pays, for that which has been expended in his education.

Dr. Howe's mute boarding-house plan seems feasible, and therefore, it is hoped, will receive a fair trial. In the first and second years, if success crowns it, the plan will continue *ad infinitum*. And concerning articulation, though I am still examining the practicability of teaching the deaf-mute articulation, I venture to advise you to try the experiment which that philosophical gentleman has asserted would prove successful; but at all events it ought to be cultivated in children who lost their hearing in childhood.

To sum up the whole in one word. Seeing that the old system, both educational and religious, has taken root so deeply in the old institutions that any new system could not be fairly tried by them, Massachusetts is earnestly urged to become the pioneer of the new way for her mute children to the desired goal, and I am sure that the other States will follow her noble example by establishing *new and better institutions*.

Yours respectfully,

(Signed,)

JOHN CARLIN.

Mr. Carlin writes, in reference to the remark of Dr. Howe, that deaf-mutes are unable to do common things,—“There are too many vagabonds, idlers, among the mutes. It is a sad fact.” I inquired the cause. “The main cause,” he says, “of the vagrancy is their aversion to the trades which they were obliged to learn at school.” I inquired how it could best be cured? He replied, “By receiving pupils at an early age. Give them eight years of good education and play, and at sixteen years of age, the *graduates* will learn trades of their own choice.”

I would add, that Mr. Carlin, the gentleman whose paper I have read, was the orator on the occasion of dedicating the monument to Gallaudet; and Mr. Smith, whose paper I read at the last meeting, delivered the address at the fiftieth anniversary of the opening of the institution. These facts show the estimation in which these gentlemen are held by

their companions, as I believe the choice was made, in each case, by the community of deaf-mutes.

Mr. Smith desires me to read the following, with reference to the question which Mr. Wright asked Dr. Howe. Mr. Smith, I think, was one of the petitioners for such a village as is spoken of in the pamphlet. "On page 21 of the anonymous pamphlet, the writer says,—'Some few years ago, he (Dr. Howe) was a petitioner, and a most active advocate, for a plan of collecting the deaf-mutes in a village, where they might be taught and enjoy religious worship by themselves.' Now, I was with Dr. Howe at that time, and the position he took was just the opposite. A report in full of his speech was made at the time in the 'Gallaudet Guide and Journal,' published by deaf-mutes. The position he took then was just the same that he takes now."

Dr. HOWE. I would take the liberty of saying, in addition to what I said with regard to the size of the contemplated institution, that I believe it is entirely feasible to have an institution for all the deaf-mutes of Massachusetts on a very much smaller and less expensive scale than the one at Hartford. The remark of Mr. Sanborn brings to my mind what I ought to have said before, that in the teaching of trades, I believe we can advantageously copy a practice in one of the institutions in Rome for the reform of boys. The boys, instead of being taught trades in the institution, are required to select a trade. One says he will be a tinman, another a shoemaker, another a blacksmith, and the officers of the institution go out and find in the neighborhood a good tinman, or blacksmith, or shoemaker, and say to him,—“We want you to take this boy every morning, and teach him your trade among your other boys. He will bring his dinner, and at night return to the institution.” I believe that a deaf-mute can learn his trade much more advantageously in an ordinary shop than at the asylum, after he has got a little acquaintance with language, has had a little training in preparation for his trade, and a little training in the use of his tools. By paying a man less than it will cost you to keep him in school, you will have that boy brought up where he ought to be,—not among mutes, but among ordinary workmen. He will become accustomed to an ordinary shop, and the ordinary routine of a shop, and his whole education will go on very much much more advantageously than it can if you take 150 or 200 of them, and keep them all together in one shop. Why? Because everything there goes on according to the deaf-mute idea, and when the individual goes into an ordinary shop, he finds everything going on according to the ideas of hearing men. They are entirely different schools. In the one case, you get such a school as he has always got to practice in in after life, which is very much better than

the artificial school which you have in the institution. I suppose, therefore, that if a school is started in Massachusetts, they will be able to dispense with such a great manufacturing establishment as they have at Hartford, which is carried on at considerable expense, and that nothing more will be done than simply to give the child some general knowledge of the use of tools, and then put him into an ordinary shop, with those with whom he has got to associate in after life, and there let him learn his trade, as those learn it who have got to use it afterwards; and in addition to that, he has the immense advantage of making acquaintances and friends among the young men learning the trade with him, which will be of great benefit to him through life. Look at the difference. A deaf-mute goes into a shop where there are ten or a dozen men, and they become his friends, and remember him in after life. "I knew John when he was a boy," they say; "I learned my trade with him." He thus forms relations and intimacies which will be of immense advantage. Let him be shut up in an institution for eight or ten years, and when he goes out into the world, he knows nobody, comparatively. This system will simplify the matter very much; it will reduce the expense very much; and I confidently anticipate that the institution, after it has been in existence for four or five years, can be carried on at a less price than is now paid.

MR. WRIGHT. If the idea of establishing this institution in Massachusetts should be carried out, should you recommend, from your experience and knowledge on the subject, the establishment of one large institution, or of several schools in different parts of the State?

DR. HOWE. I should certainly recommend the establishment of several small schools in different parts of the State—two or three, to begin with. These will not necessitate great buildings. The first idea of Americans seems to be, that an institution must be a great pile of brick and mortar. We want to avail ourselves of the institution of the human family, as it exists among us, for the instruction of the deaf and dumb.

MR. DUDLEY. Under whose supervision would you have this new institution put? Would you have a commission?

DR. HOWE. Either a commission, or the Board of Education, or the Board of State Charities.

MR. DUDLEY. Under your plan, would not the details be left to them? It does not follow that all these suggestions would necessarily be carried out, does it? They would have to be left, I suppose, to the judgment of the commissioners?

DR. HOWE. Of course, to commissioners appointed by the Governor, who would arrange all the details of the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you confine the teaching to articulation, and refuse to teach the manual system?

Dr. HOWE. I would confine the teaching to the system of articulation, in all cases where the child had had his hearing during any period of his youth, and who otherwise was ordinarily bright.

Mr. DUDLEY. Do you object to the use of the finger language? Does not that help the pupil to acquire a knowledge of new words?

Dr. HOWE. It is not half so much help as words themselves. The English language is copious enough to explain new words; and if you wanted to explain a new word, you would find words fast enough.

Mr. DUDLEY. If a child goes on to a new class of words, the first one of which is nearly synonymous with another, how will you aid that child to understand one word by another word that he does *not* understand?

Dr. HOWE. As well as I can a hearing boy. I find no difficulty in teaching hearing boys.

Mr. DUDLEY. My question is suggested by experience. I have never learned the sign language, because I wanted to encourage a perfect knowledge of English; but I have wished many times that I could use a sign when I got into a pinch. Perhaps I am lacking in ingenuity, but I think it would help me sometimes.

Dr. HOWE. That is very natural. That is the idea of natural signs. When a man cannot get the word, he ekes it out with a sign. I find it hardly possible to avoid it, sometimes.

Mr. DUDLEY. I do not believe in making it a substitute for words at all.

Dr. HOWE. I, for one, am not at all prepared to go into any details with regard to the institution. The whole matter is vague in that respect.

Mr. DUDLEY. It is not the business of the Committee to fix upon the details. The simple question is, whether we shall have a new institution, one or more, in Massachusetts.

Dr. HOWE. The question is, whether the Governor shall have it in his power, at his discretion to place such deaf-mutes as shall apply to him in charge of competent persons in Massachusetts, either at a private school, or elsewhere? It does not imply the necessity of putting one brick on top of another, as I understand.

Mr. SANBORN. I am informed that, although Mr. Hubbard, who appeared before the Committee at the last hearing, is too unwell to be present to-day, his little daughter, of whom he spoke, is here with her mother and governess, and if the Committee desire to see her, they can have the opportunity. This child lost her hearing at the age of

five, at which time she articulated very imperfectly, and has been taught exclusively by the method of articulation. She does not understand the signs; I believe she does not understand the manual alphabet. She is, therefore, an example of the teaching of articulation, pure and simple, carried on between the ages of five and nine years, which is her present age, and which is below the average age at which pupils are received at Hartford. To show the proficiency of pupils taught under the other system, I quote from a report on the New York Institution,—an official document of the Assembly of that State, for the year 1851. In regard to arithmetic, Prof. Day says:—

“It did not appear, so far as could be judged, that the pupils for the first five years obtain anything more, as a general rule, than a good acquaintance with the four ground rules. Those who had been at the institution six years showed same knowledge of fractions, while those a year further advanced, had paid attention to interest and the rule of three.”

They would then be sixteen or seventeen years old. This little girl is nine. With regard to geography, he says:—

“Any considerable knowledge of the earth and its inhabitants must obviously be deferred until the latter part of the course. The Committee found, however, that the pupils of two and three years standing had been allowed, by way of relaxation, to spend a short time in the school hours in drawing outline maps. . . . During the fourth and fifth years, the pupils had been taught the names and capitals of various countries, especially of the different States of the Union, together with the names of the principal cities, mountains, etc., on the globe, and gave correct answers to the questions that were put.”

HENRY W. MUZZEY, Esq. I ought to say, in behalf of Mr. Hubbard, who is unable to be here this morning, that his little girl has had no training for this exhibition. She has been taught by a private teacher at home, not in association with other pupils, and has never been subjected to any such trial as she now meets. How she may meet it we cannot say. She has been under private instruction for three years only. She lost her hearing at five, and is now nine. One year since she was deprived of her hearing, she was not under instruction. Three facts have been developed by this method of instruction. First, she knows about as much as other children of her age who have the power of speech and hearing. Secondly, she is able to express her ideas by articulation so that any one will understand them. Thirdly, she is able to understand others; the ideas of other persons may be communicated to her by the same method. These facts are illustrated by the results of the teaching in her case, whether they may or may not be now successfully exhibited to the Committee.

Several questions in arithmetic and geography were then put, orally, to the little girl,—May Hubbard,—by her governess, (such as “Five times nine are how many?”—“Five in thirty-five how many times?”—“What gulf lies south of the United States?”—“Where is the Caribbean Sea?”) which were answered promptly and correctly, and with a bright, intelligent expression of countenance. The little girl also read a short passage from a school-book, and answered some simple questions in history. Her governess then spoke to her for some little time of the Atlantic cable, the child manifestly following readily the motion of the lips, and comprehending the story. The Chairman (to test her readiness in reading from the lips of other persons), then told her the name of the man through whose exertions the cable was laid—Cyrus Field; but May did not understand him; whereupon Mr. Wright spoke the same name, and she repeated it after him at once.

In answer to questions from the Chairman and other gentlemen of the Committee, the governess said that May found some difficulty in understanding other persons than her teacher and mother; that she (the teacher) never saw a deaf-mute until she saw this little girl, and then took up her own method of instruction: and that she did not use writing in communicating with her, except in a case of hurry, where her attention was distracted, always in other cases using her lips.

Mrs. Hubbard, in reply to a question of Dr. Howe, stated, that the life-effort of May's parents was to keep her with other children; that she played with other children in the neighborhood, went to dancing-school with other children, took part in all their games, and her own desire was to be with other children and like other children as much as possible; that since she had been in the Senate Chamber she had asked why the deaf-mutes did not speak with the lips as she did, for she thought it was a great deal better to talk with the mouth than with the fingers; that the children of the neighborhood played with her as pleasantly and happily as possible, they understanding her and she them, she making no more signs than other children do, so that it often might be difficult to select the deaf child; that, at the time she lost her hearing, she did not know all her letters, and pronounced very few consonants; that their children had all spoken very imperfectly, a little girl younger than May, five years and a half old, not pronouncing the letter *s* at all; and May's pronunciation was quite as imperfect before her sickness.

In reply to questions by Mr. Dudley and Mr. Sanborn, the governess said she thought she could do justice to as many scholars as could sit in front of her and look in her face; she thought, when they first began, they would have to look directly at her face, but she could hold her head down and talk with May, or could have her on one side; she did

not think she should necessarily have to teach them to articulate one by one, but that she could speak the same word to all, and require them all to repeat it at the same time; she supposed that, as in other schools, she would have to ask one child a question and hear the answer, and perhaps correct it, before she asked another child a question; she thought she could teach two to articulate in the same time as one; she could not say how many she would undertake to teach, beginning as she did with the little girl, because she never thought of it; she had had May from nine to two, every day, with four other children, who had learned their lessons and recited them entirely separate from her, and she had not devoted any more time to her out of school than to any other child; that she repeated the Lord's Prayer in concert with the other children every morning, and in the exercise of singing, although she did not sing, she repeated the words at the same time with the other children.

In this connection, Mrs. Hubbard stated that May preferred to choose and learn a prayer for herself, rather than the one they had taught her, showing that she had some idea of what prayer was. She had found no difficulty whatever in communicating to her ideas of the Heavenly Father and a future life, and thought she was in advance of other children, a year or two younger. In the Sabbath school, where there were some fifty scholars, her knowledge of Bible subjects was very far in advance of theirs. She read the Bible stories, when out of school, for her own amusement, and she (Mrs. H.) thought she had as good an idea on all these subjects as any child of her age. Mrs. Hubbard said she did not know any signs, and found words much the simpler method of teaching.

Miss H. B. ROGERS, who has a private school for deaf-mutes at Chelmsford, having signified a willingness to give any information in her power to the Committee, was asked several questions, in reply to which she said:—In my school I have not been able to test how many pupils can be taught articulation at one time. My pupils are all of different capacities, and have been brought to me one at a time, except in one instance, when I had two pupils brought to me, one a congenital mute, and the other, one who lost his hearing at five and one-half years of age, and had been deaf two years. He had no means of understanding others, but remembered to talk. Of course these children had not had the same opportunities, but they neither of them understood anything from the lips. The little boy who became deaf at five and a half years old, spoke, perhaps, four or five words; I remember he knew the words "father" and "mother." One young man came about three weeks after that, who lost his hearing when seven years of age, but

remembered to talk; and two other children, one a little girl of five, and the other a little boy of eight, came near together, but there was such a difference in their ages that they could not be taught at the same time, so that I have had no opportunity to test the question how many can be taught together. I have seven pupils in all, and teach by articulation entirely. I have one assistant. We are obliged to be mother and nurse, as well as teacher, and that care is much greater than that of teacher. Four of the pupils are together in arithmetic adding numbers. I see no reason why, in a class like that, ten or fifteen could not read from the teacher's lips at once. When I begin to teach articulation, I teach each child separately, as in the common schools. There you must point to each letter, and ask each child separately what it is. You must pursue the same course with the deaf and dumb. I can teach several to pronounce the sound of the letter at once; I do not know how many, because I have never had any opportunity to test it.

The congenital deaf-mute I spoke of knew nothing of articulation—he had never articulated a word. He came the first day of June last. I placed him before me and breathed upon his hand, and taught him to breathe upon it. When he could do that, he had the power of the letter *h*. The first day I gave him the power of five letters, but he could not articulate either of them aloud. The second day, I think it was, he articulated one or two of those letters aloud; and the third day I taught him his first word—"p-i-e." He repeated it many times before he made an audible sound, but he did once or twice that day repeat the word in an audible voice. He knew four words when he came to me, as I have stated, when he saw them in a book, and he could also write his own name, and knew it when it was written. He did not know the letters of it, but imitated his name when it was set for a copy; and I do not know but he could write the names of two or three of his family at home.

MR. WRIGHT. Is Miss Rogers a native of Massachusetts?

MISS ROGERS. Yes, sir.

MR. WRIGHT. Then you are a Yankee, and can *guess* how many you could teach?

MISS ROGERS. I *guess*, in a class in arithmetic, fourteen or fifteen; I *guess*, in regard to articulation, a class of six. That is what I want to get in the spring—a new class of six, of equal standing, to begin and give it a fair trial.

DR. HOWE. In some of the small German schools, six is the number.

MR. WRIGHT. Does Miss Rogers find any more difficulty in imparting ideas upon religious or spiritual subjects, than upon any other?

MISS ROGERS. No, sir; not when they have language enough to comprehend it. They can comprehend that subject as well as others, if they have sufficient language. I had one little girl under instruction two years. She had been with me a year when I taught her about God. I told her then of God as the Creator; I then told her nothing of His being her Father. Since then I have told her about God being her Father, and I have told her about God being everywhere. At first, I gave her locality. I pointed up, and told her He was in heaven, and told her about people going there who died here. I gave her the idea of another life before I told her anything of death. I kept from her as much as possible the knowledge that any of her friends had died, until I had given her the idea of another life. When I had familiarized her mind with the idea of her friends being in heaven, then I told her about death. After the last vacation, she came back to me, and in her little prayer, in which, after saying, "Now I lay me down to sleep," she repeats, "Our Father in heaven," (she either commences or ends with that,)—after repeating that, she said, "Me good," and then I told her she might say, "Our Father in heaven, make me a good girl," and now she is delighted that she can add to her prayer. She is very much interested in the fact that God is everywhere. At first I told her He was in the room. She wanted to know if He was in Europe, Africa, Asia and Australia. I told her He was. Just as soon as a child can know language so that these ideas can be given to her, I see no difficulty.

THE CHAIRMAN. Would you find any difficulty in teaching a child the difference between "father" and "feather?"

MISS ROGERS. I do not remember any. The mouth is opened much more in saying "father" than in saying "feather." There is one little boy, who has been with us but seven months, who will distinguish sound so accurately, that, if he took pains, I think if I should pronounce these two words, he would point out on the cards the sound of the vowels, and distinguish the *a* in "father" from the *e* in "feather."

The congenital mute of whom I spoke, who knew so little when he came, now writes home a letter to his parents every week without assistance. Of course it is imperfect in sentences, but still it contains ideas. I have one of his letters with me. [The letter was exhibited to the Committee.] He can count to 100, and can add small numbers, like 9 and 8, or 27 and 10. He spells some four hundred words, and reads sentences—forms sentences. He is eight years of age now. When his father and mother came to see me, a year ago this winter, they had then taught him the finger alphabet. I asked them, when they decided to send him to me, to ignore that entirely—never to allow him to use it again. He had learned on his fingers the word "stove." Since he

came to me I have never said anything to him about the use of his fingers.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Howe, here is a practical question. Prof. Bartlett stands here, hears what is said, and communicates it to all the deaf-mutes present; they all get a general idea of what takes place. Suppose he was not here, and they did not have the manual system to guide them, how would you make them understand what you say?

Dr. HOWE. I think that, by placing myself squarely before them, if they were trained to it, they could catch most of what I said. But my reply to that would be, that after I had trained the children to a perfect knowledge of articulation, then I would give them the means of addressing people at a distance; the same as, after I have given my son a good knowledge of English, I teach him French. But I would not mix up the two in the course of training. I would not teach him the second until the first had become vernacular, so that it would not go out of him. I think that a mistake arises from our not observing the marvellous variations in these motions. Laura Bridgman, who is here, perceives differences between people's fingers. I think a more marvellous case still was that of the girl in the Hartford school who could distinguish the clothes which persons wore. She would take a glove, and say, that belongs to that hand, and that to the other. So it is with the motions of the face. There is an infinity of variation which we do not perceive until we turn our attention to it. It is incredible to ordinary people that deaf-mutes can understand by the lips; but if gentlemen will reflect a little, they will see how it is. In a railroad car, for instance, you hear persons talking, and although you cannot distinguish a word, you know that they say "yes" or "no" by the motion of the lips.

Dr. Howe, to illustrate this point, went to Laura Bridgman, and having a thick worsted mitten on his hand, spelled out a question on her hand. She was then asked what the doctor had asked her, and she replied, "Where are we?" which the doctor said was the question he put.

Mr. Sanborn, to show how highly the power of articulation is valued by deaf-mutes, read a line written by Mr. Carlin: "A million of golden eagles for such blessings as are enjoyed by this fortunate child." He would gladly resign, said Mr. Sanborn, the power he possesses of being understood forty feet off for the privileges she enjoys.

Prof. BARTLETT. While Miss Rogers was speaking, I observed that she very sedulously avoided the use of the hand. In my experience, where I have had occasion to correct the articulation of deaf-mutes, I have found it a very great aid to revert to the use of the alphabet; and

it seems to me that pupils need not, necessarily, be injuriously diverted or hindered by that medium.

MISS ROGERS. I see no reason for the use of my fingers, if there is perfect communication between me and the pupil. I do not need to use my fingers to tell a child how to pronounce; I cannot do it to nearly so good advantage as with the lips. If the child is familiar with the different sounds of the alphabet from my lips, I can give the pronunciation of a word with them; but it is very difficult to give the pronunciation of a word with my fingers. I tested this somewhat when I took the little girl I have had with me two years. She lost her hearing when she was three and one-half years old, and the only word she could articulate when she came to me was the word "boy." That was all the communication between us. I thought this would afford me an opportunity to give articulation a fair trial. I knew nothing of it, except that it had been tried abroad; but I thought that what had been done abroad could be done here. I visited a lady in Providence who had taught articulation, got what information I could from her, and went home. I found, after the little girl had been with me two months, that the finger language was so much more definite than reading from the lips, that she was not satisfied unless the signs were used, and that the two systems could not be used together. I then took her and went to visit her parents, and told them they must decide which system they would choose. My preference was for articulation. They decided upon articulation. Then, just as soon as she could make any articulate sound for the words she had learned, I obliged her to give up the finger language, and now she knows nothing of it.

THE CHAIRMAN. Do you agree with Dr. Howe, that you would teach the manual alphabet as supplementary to articulation?

MISS ROGERS. I should have no objection, after the child was well taught to articulate. There are times when it is convenient to use the finger language, and I see no reason why it is any more objectionable for a mute to know the finger language than any other person.

MR. DUDLEY. Do you use the pen or pencil at all?

MISS ROGERS. Never to give instruction. There is no necessity for it. If we teach a child a new word, we teach him to write it at the same time.

DR. HOWE. There is another reason in favor of the system of articulation, of which every person who has thought much upon the subject will see the force: namely, that it is very important for all persons to exercise all the organs of the body. Now, the lungs and throat are among the most important organs of the body, and a deaf-mute child labors under this great disadvantage, in addition to all the others, that he is more liable to diseases of the throat and lungs in

consequence of the entire disuse of the organs of speech, than he would be if he used them. The use of articulation, or mere vocal gymnastics, is a matter of very great importance in hygiene. If I had a deaf-mute child, if it were only with a view to his health, I would make him use his organs of articulation as much as possible, because that involves the muscles of the chest, it involves the lungs, it involves the whole circulation. Every gentleman who has been accustomed to speaking knows that there is very considerable effort attending it, that the whole system is quickened, and when it is not continued so long as to fatigue, it is beneficial. In diseases of a scrofulous character, reading aloud is prescribed for the benefit of the health. I have no doubt that many a deaf-mute has been hurried into consumption by the disuse of the throat and lungs. That is, I think, that where there is a tendency to consumption, and where the question is decided by an apparent trifle, the apparent trifle of a disuse of the lungs will turn the scale against the life of the person. Therefore, if it were only as a matter of hygiene, I would train all deaf-mutes to articulate.

The CHAIRMAN [to Miss Rogers.] You would not use the manual system, because you think the pupils would then give less attention to articulation, not because you could not educate them quicker by uniting the two systems?

Miss ROGERS. I do not think you could educate them so quickly, because their attention would be distracted. With the system of articulation, their attention is fixed entirely upon the human lips; they have no connection with the human hand. If both systems were taught, they would be thinking of both, and I think it would divide their attention, and they would not advance so rapidly.

Prof. BARTLETT. I would ask Miss Rogers whether the use of the written alphabet does not distract the attention as much as the manual?

Miss ROGERS. They must have the written language; but I see no reason why we should give them the manual, the written language and the spoken language.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Howe spoke of children at Malta who speak four languages. Were they worse or better educated by knowing four languages instead of two or one?

Dr. HOWE. I did not cite that as illustrating the best mode of instruction, but merely as an instance of the great facility in childhood of acquiring languages. I do not exactly agree with Miss Rogers in respect to this matter of the two systems. I would certainly go thus far: I would have, at whatever cost, one language that should be the child's vernacular, just as I want my son, although he learns to speak French and German, to think in English, and have no other vernacular. But, however interesting this matter is, it seems to me aside from the

question. The question is, Shall the deaf-mutes of Massachusetts be instructed at home? Neither the Board of State Charities, nor any other persons who interest themselves in this matter, have proposed any particular mode of instruction. Whether it shall be by articulation, or by signs, or by any other mode, is for more competent persons in the State to decide. The only question is, whether Massachusetts people are capable of teaching their own children, and whether they ought to do so. With regard to the particular mode, I am willing to leave that to the good sense of the people of the State.

Mr. BRANNING. I would like to ask Miss Rogers whether it would not require some skill on the part of an ordinary person to put a question to a deaf-mute so as to be understood?

Miss ROGERS. I do not think it would require skill, but care. The mouth must be opened much more than in ordinary speech. When we came to Boston last November, the little boy who came to me when he was seven years old, and only knew half a dozen words, told me he understood the conductor when he asked him if he was going to take the omnibus. I do not know that the conductor knew he was a mute.

Mr. BRANNING. Would not a person need some special instruction in order to be competent to teach by articulation?

Miss ROGERS. I had no particular instruction before I undertook to teach; neither had my assistant.

Mr. SANBORN. I would like to present, this morning, a few arguments in addition to those which have been already presented, speaking only for myself, and not for any other persons; and I would like also to say, that there are other gentlemen who have considerations to present for whom I am not authorized to speak. I do not know what course of argument may be adopted by the fifty deaf-mutes whose communication I read this morning. I know nothing about their purposes, except as shown by that paper. I can only, therefore, speak for myself. Speaking for myself, I would like to call the attention of the Committee to one or two matters, which, although they have been alluded to, have not, perhaps, been so dwelt upon as to bring out their full force.

I had occasion to state at the last hearing, that the most important feature of the question, in my estimation, was the early education of deaf-mute children, without regard to the methods of teaching—about which, however, I have very decided convictions. The removal, as it is called, of the deaf-mutes from Hartford, or, as I should prefer to call it, the education of our deaf-mute children at home, will give us the means, if there are any means, of educating the deaf-mutes at an early age. We certainly can educate them early in Massachusetts, where they live, if they can be educated early at all. I want to say a few words upon

that point, referring to some experiments in regard to it which have been carried on in other countries.

To begin, I would remind the Committee that the course of instruction at Hartford is now limited to such as have reached the age of eight years and^a upwards. The age was originally fixed at twelve years, or perhaps at some higher age. The limit, at any rate, remained for some years at twelve; then it was reduced to ten, and finally to eight, where it now stands, for a certain class of pupils. As Dr. Howe has so well said, and as I think I can testify from an experience of some years in the instruction of children, the years which are the most valuable to the child, whether he be deaf or not, for the acquisition of language, are the years before he reaches the age of eight. I hope there will be no need to discuss this matter, but I would like to say, that I take it to be a principle fully established, that the early years of the child, in respect to intellectual training, in respect to moral training, and in respect to religious training, are the most important of all the years which that child will live; and that being the case, nothing but the actual impossibility of conveying instruction to deaf-mute children previous to the age of eight years ought to prevent us from undertaking their education as early as it is feasible—say at four, five or six years of age.

Now, in an institution like that at Hartford, even if the managers were willing to establish a primary department and receive young children, it is very doubtful whether they would receive many, because they would not be allowed to leave home at so early an age. This is a difficulty which has presented itself to the gentlemen who manage the Hartford institution, and which was very ably discussed by Mr. Stone, about a dozen years ago, in a paper which I hold in my hand. It has presented itself to the instructors of the deaf and dumb in our country, and in every country where this instruction has been carried on. I do not bring it forward for the first time; it is no novelty; it has been considered; it has been very fully examined and discussed in almost every civilized country of the world, and particularly in two or three of the countries of Europe. About twenty-five years ago, a French gentleman, who had received an appointment as one of the physicians to the institution for deaf mutes in Paris,—I refer to Dr. Blanchet,—had his attention turned to the education of deaf-mutes. He had before considered the condition of their health, their malady of deafness, to which he had directed a good deal of attention, and made some very interesting experiments; but some twenty-five years ago, he passed from that to the question of education, which came under his observation daily in this large institution with which he was connected. About the year 1847, I think, he brought the matter to the notice of the French government,

and received from one of the ministers of the then reigning king, Louis Philippe, (I think the Minister of the Interior,) instructions and authority to visit the deaf-mute schools of Europe, particularly of Belgium and Germany, for the purpose of examining into their methods of instruction, and to see whether there were any improvements which could be introduced into the French method of instruction, which in some respects is very similar to ours. Starting from this point, twenty years ago, this gentleman has been pursuing this investigation. He very soon came to this question of the early instruction of deaf-mutes, and he has developed in a series of pamphlets, addressed sometimes to learned bodies in France, sometimes to the government, and sometimes to the public, a plan for the education of deaf-mute children in the common schools of France. This plan, as early as the year 1858, was so fully developed, and commended itself so well to the then Minister of the Interior, under the present Emperor, that he issued circulars to the Prefects of the Departments, recommending the adoption of this system in the various Departments of France. At the same time, the Board of Education of the Department of the Seine, in which Paris is situated, authorized the establishment of a certain number of schools within the limits of Paris. I think three of these schools were established as early as 1856. At the last accounts which I have received, there were ten of those schools established within the municipality of Paris, which were attended, as my information shows, by about one hundred and fifty children. These children were of various ages, and a good many of them below the age at which children in this country are received into institutions for the education of deaf-mutes. In all these schools, I think, speaking children were also taught; at any rate, it was so in some of them. This experiment has now been going on for ten years, has been extending every year for ten years; and I have seen a letter from Dr. Blanchet, written about nine months ago, in which he says that the system has been still more favored by the government of France, and that steps are now being taken to make it as general as he would himself desire.

This is a matter in regard to which I cannot enter into particulars at this hearing, but I will submit to the Committee, if they will allow me, a paper on this subject which I read at a meeting in New Haven, in October last, which is made up in considerable part from the publications of Dr. Blanchet, and presents, to some extent, the methods and arguments used by him, and which gives some interesting statistics as to the condition of the deaf-mute class in France.

That is one matter which I would like to bring to the attention of the Committee; and I would like further to say, that this question of the education of deaf-mute children in early life has also been treated at

considerable length by a gentleman now dead, but who for more than forty years was a teacher of deaf-mutes in Belgium—the Abbé Carton. He wrote extensively on almost every subject relating to the education of deaf-mutes, and in a paper which was read at a meeting in London, in 1862, before the death of Carton, he made a strong statement with regard to the possibility of educating these children, along with other pupils, in the common schools, which I would like to read, among other reasons, because it does not involve this question of articulation. The Abbé Carton, although he taught articulation, also taught the other method, and made great use of the manual alphabet; and in this passage which I am about to read, he suggests the manual alphabet as the means of communicating with children in the common schools:—

“I have observed,” says the Abbé, “for more than forty years, that speaking children enter into conversation with deaf-mute children much more readily than grown men. The presence of a little mute in the common school would accustom all the pupils to converse with him, and from that time he would no longer live by himself; each pupil would acquaint himself with the manual alphabet, which would thus become common and would be used for words and phrases; and so the poor little deaf-mute would be restored to society, and would profit by the relation to acquire useful ideas. Do not imagine that this is only the dream of a man who wishes well to the deaf and dumb. I venture to assert, and I accept very willingly all the responsibility of the assertion, that every school-master, and especially every school-mistress, who would undertake to teach a deaf-mute to write and to understand the written words, would succeed. There is not a teacher of either sex, who, after an hour’s conversation upon this subject, would not be able to begin profitably the instruction of a deaf-mute child, and to succeed in making him comprehend the meaning of common words.”

This is the statement of a gentleman who, at that time, I suppose, was past seventy, an old clergyman of the Catholic Church, who for more than forty years had been conducting, very successfully, an establishment in Belgium, which has been visited by Professor Day, by Professor Weld, I believe by Dr. Peet, by Dr. Howe, and by Dr. Blanchet, and of which they all speak in the highest terms. This is evidence that cannot be impeached by any gentleman, from any quarter. At the time of his death, which I believe was about two years ago, the position of the Abbé Carton in the instruction of deaf-mutes in Europe corresponded in some degree with that of Dr. Gallaudet in this country, and that of the Abbé de l’Épée, the founder of the French system of instruction, seventy-five years ago. This is his deliberate statement, translated as well as I could translate it from a paper in French, read in London in 1862.

MR. DUDLEY. That, if I understand it, goes to the extent of having deaf-mutes educated in the district schools where they live.

Mr. SANBORN. Yes, sir; that is exactly what he advocates, as I understand.

Mr. DUDLEY. That is not proposed by anybody in Massachusetts, is it?

Mr. SANBORN. I do not know how that is, but I thought the Committee ought to be informed that the experiment has been tried in Europe, and successfully tried. I would state that Dr. Blanchet favors articulation; but the Abbé Carton, though he used it, used other methods of instruction also. But neither the worthy Abbé nor Dr. Blanchet see so much difficulty in the art, in which they became proficient, as the gentlemen in this country who undertake to carry on the instruction of deaf-mutes.

Whether it be possible or not to conduct the early education of deaf-mute children in the common schools to the extent which this venerable teacher maintains, I have not the means of saying; and I apprehend there is no person in this country who has the means of saying, because nobody in this country, so far as I am aware, has ever tried it. But it does seem to me that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, whose especial pride has always been her system of common schools, should at least put it in her own power to try the experiment of carrying on the education of deaf-mutes in schools throughout the Commonwealth, which is so important, and which comes to us so highly recommended.

I have made some inquiries with a view to ascertain the number of deaf-mute children living in cities and thickly-settled localities, who might attend such schools in case they were established; the returns of the census are not in such form that I should be able to give the number definitely; but if the Committee will consider that the population of Massachusetts, at the present time, is something less than 1,300,000, and that more than 200,000, or nearly a sixth part of that population, reside in the County of Suffolk, (probably more than 200,000, at the present moment, in the City of Boston,) and that within the limits of easy access to a common school in this neighborhood there are probably 300,000 persons, or nearly a fourth part of the population of the State, they will see that there are probably deaf-mute children enough in this immediate neighborhood to try that experiment, if it should be deemed advisable to try it in this Commonwealth. The number is probably about 650. It is stated in the census of 1860 as 512; but I observe, in the same census, the number in Connecticut is stated at 476, which, I have no doubt, includes the pupils at Hartford. In that case, the 476 in Connecticut include 100 of the deaf-mutes of Massachusetts. I suppose some of these were also counted in Massachusetts, but I imagine that 650 is none too large for the number in Massachusetts. If there are 650 deaf-mute persons in Massachusetts,

and if there are 150 children capable of instruction out of that number, as we have reason to believe, from our own inquiries, then probably in Boston and the large towns in the neighborhood of Boston, there are from 30 to 40 children capable of instruction, many of whom cannot be received at Hartford, on account of their youth; others cannot be received because the list is full, or for some other reason; and these children might be instructed in schools nearer home.

I do not put myself forward, Mr. Chairman, as a distinct advocate of this method, because, as I said before, I do not think we have information enough to enable us to say that the experiment would certainly succeed; but I think the State should put herself in a position to try that experiment, which, I am convinced, is the very pivot of the whole matter of instructing deaf-mutes. If we can instruct them from the age of four upwards, we then counteract one of the greatest difficulties which gentlemen who carry on their instruction meet with at every stage of their progress; that is to say, the difficulty of an unprepared state of mind, at an age when other children are capable of receiving the instruction imparted, and turning it to some useful purpose. That is the point which I desired to bring before the Committee as fully and strongly as I could.

REV. THOMAS WILSON, of Stoughton. I simply wish to call attention to the fact, that in the Stoughtonham Institute, which is a private academy in Sharon, four miles from where I reside, there is a deaf-mute—a little girl—I should judge, by her size, about ten or eleven years of age. Mr. Billings, the teacher, informed me that she lost her hearing about the age of five or six, I think through scarlatina. She had, of course, learned to talk previous to that time, but I think that her school education had not progressed far. I noticed, in the recitation in arithmetic, that she kept up with her class of five or six, and that she replied to the questions of the teacher simply from her observation of his lips. She replied as correctly and as promptly as any other pupil of the class. And it was so in regard to all the other recitations. I think it was only in arithmetic that I heard her recite, but the teacher said she replied as promptly and understood him as readily when he addressed any question to her, or gave her any information, as any other scholar he had.

MR. DUDLEY. Did you suspect she was a deaf-mute from anything you saw?

MR. WILSON. Yes, sir; from the tone of the voice, which was similar to that of the little girl who was here this morning. Otherwise I should not have noticed it, probably.

MR. DUDLEY. Does the teacher take pupils of all ages?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir. It is a private school, and he takes children of all ages. He has now an assistant, so that he takes young scholars.

Dr. STONE. Is her hearing entirely lost?

Mr. WILSON. I think it is. It is my impression that it was entirely lost at the age of five or six. She has had no private teacher. Her parents are intelligent persons. Her father is a farmer. The teacher did not speak of any special pains that had been taken to teach her articulation, only that she was careful that she should see the motion of her lips.

Mr. PERRY. I understand that she has not lost her voice?

Mr. WILSON. She has never lost her voice, but entirely lost her hearing, and has that tone of voice that deaf persons ordinarily have.

Mr. SANBORN. What I have now said, and one additional remark, closes the case as far as I am concerned, and I will rest there. The additional remark I desire to make is, that the suggestion I have made with regard to the mode of instructing deaf-mutes early is applicable to the method of articulation. Without entering into the question whether that method is correct, or to how many children it is applicable, I maintain that children who have lost their hearing, but who retain the faculty of speech, should at once, without the loss of a day, if possible, have that faculty cultivated and improved; and I am prepared, if necessary, to show that that mode of teaching by which the faculty of speech is retained and improved, is very much neglected at Hartford and in almost every institution for the instruction of deaf-mutes in this country. I want to urge upon the Committee this consideration: that Massachusetts ought to have it in her power to have articulation taught to such children—and everybody admits there are some—who can profit by it.

Adjourned to 2 o'clock, P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Committee met at two o'clock, and were addressed by Dr. STONE, Principal of the American Asylum at Hartford. He said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee:—As this is an important case, affecting very seriously the interests of the deaf and dumb of Massachusetts, I very much regret that those gentlemen who are in favor of the Governor's recommendation have not felt inclined to submit frankly and immediately their reasons for this movement. It is not our desire at all to occupy the time of the Committee; but we have some definite reasons why we think that it is not worth while to make the proposed change, and I will proceed to state them.

It has been the impression of the gentlemen at Hartford, for a long time, that the relation which the institution sustains to the States of New England is not fully understood; and it is very evident, from the remarks of gentlemen this morning, that they do not understand what we conceive to be the relation of that institution to these different States. If the gentlemen will allow me, I will state very briefly the facts in regard to the establishment of the institution, how this relation was first consummated, and how the Directors now feel in regard to it.

You are aware that the Hartford institution was the first school of the kind established in the country. Interest in the subject was first excited by a deaf and dumb girl in the family of Dr. Cogswell. She was a very interesting child, and they could not bear the idea that she should grow up in ignorance, and yet there seemed to be no alternative, unless she went abroad. The impression seemed to prevail that there were very few situated as she was, but a little inquiry revealed the fact that there were eighty deaf-mutes in Connecticut. Then it seemed best to select some gentleman and send him abroad to acquire the art of instructing these children, and to establish a school. On the first day of May, 1815, some gentlemen met in Hartford and subscribed a sum sufficient for this object, and Rev. Thomas Gallaudet, a graduate of Yale College, and who had recently graduated at Andover,—a man perfectly adapted to this peculiar system of instruction,—was selected for the purpose. Mr. Gallaudet left on the 15th of May. In May of the next year, the Legislature of Connecticut chartered this institution. In August, 1816, Mr. Gallaudet returned, arriving at New York, I think, on the 9th of August. He brought with him Mr. Clerc, who was a distinguished deaf-mute pupil of Sicard. He had been teaching nine years in the Royal Institution at Paris, and had shown himself to be a man of very uncommon abilities. He was a deaf-mute from birth, and had been instructed, of course, by their system. To show the acuteness of Mr. Clerc, I will mention that, although when he left Europe he knew only the French language, he acquired a knowledge of English on the voyage over. Mr. Gallaudet and Mr. Clerc went over the country to collect funds for this enterprise, and were received very kindly, and their object enlisted the sympathies of benevolent and Christian men, so much so, that the Governor of Connecticut recommended that collections should be taken up in the churches in aid of the object. In the course of three months, they collected about \$12,000, principally from individuals, but there was a small sum, I think, received from contributions in churches. Of this \$12,000, over \$2,000 were collected in Boston, and over \$5,600 in Massachusetts. In April of the next year, 1817, the school was opened at Hartford with seven pupils, and of these seven pupils, four were from Massachusetts.

The feeling was universal at that time that one school alone would suffice for the whole country, and benevolent men took hold of this measure with that impression. In collecting these funds, it had been arranged that \$200 should constitute a Vice President for life, and \$100 a Life Director. When the school started, of the twelve Vice-Presidents for life, five were from Boston, and of the thirty-nine Life Directors, fourteen, or more than one-third, were from Massachusetts.

In 1819, the State of Massachusetts, without any solicitation on the part of the Directors, voted to sustain twenty pupils at the institution for an indefinite time, until their education should be completed. In the same year, Congress gave the Directors a tract of land, without any conditions, with liberty to locate it wherever they pleased in unoccupied territory belonging to the United States. The Directors very shrewdly located it in Alabama, taking land that was under very high cultivation, and had been under cultivation for a number of years. I think the amount was about 23,000 acres, and they located it in five different sections, in order to get land of good quality. They sold this land very skilfully, and realized about \$312,000 at that time—1835. Of this fund, they invested some \$75,000 in real estate and in buildings, and placed the rest at a productive interest, intending to use the interest for the purpose for which the land was given. This land, as I have stated, was given without any conditions whatever, and the Directors would have been perfectly free to have made this a local institution, if they had pleased; to have continued it as a Connecticut asylum, and used this money for the children of Connecticut. But that was not their purpose or intention. At the next session of the Legislature, after receiving this grant, they applied for a change of their corporate name—"The Connecticut Institution for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb"—to "The American Asylum;" and they gave three reasons for the change. The first was, that the institution was started for the relief of deaf and dumb children, wherever found in the country; the second was, the fact that various individuals in New England and the Middle States had contributed very freely to the institution; and the third was, that they had received this grant from Congress, and they designed and desired to make this fund as profitable as possible for the education of the deaf-mutes of the country. The Legislature granted their request, and the name was changed at that time, for these reasons.

In 1825, Commissioners from four of the Northern States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Massachusetts—met at the Asylum, at the request of the Directors, to examine the resources of the institution, its accommodations and its management, and consider the question whether it was worth while for them to have schools of their own.

Hon. James Fowler and Hon. John Mills were the Commissioners from Massachusetts to decide this question. In 1819, Massachusetts had made provision for the education of these children at Hartford, and New Hampshire made the same provision in 1822. These Commissioners, after examining the resources of the institution, its accommodations, and the plans of the Directors, voted, unanimously, that it was for the interest of these different States to educate their deaf and dumb children at Hartford. The question then was, the sum of money that should be paid for each pupil per year to meet, with the income of the fund, the current expenses. There were two principles which the Directors established immediately after they obtained this fund. The first principle was, that in managing it, they would expend the whole income, and not attempt to accumulate it at all; and the second was, that they would expend *only* the income—would not encroach, if it was possible to avoid it, on the principal, but hold it as a sacred fund for the advancement of deaf-mute education. Their first idea was, that this institution was sufficient for the whole country. Very soon, however, other States began to have institutions for their deaf-mutes. Our institution commenced in 1817. I think the State of Kentucky started hers in 1822, the State of New York in 1818, and the institution at Philadelphia, for Pennsylvania, was started about 1819 or '20. Very soon these large States began to find that they must have institutions of their own. They very soon found this ratio, that there was one deaf-mute to every two thousand of population, and they found that they must provide for them. These institutions being established in different States, it soon became the feeling at Hartford that the special field of the American Institute was New England.

These Commissioners having voted, as I have said, that it was for the interest of their respective States to educate their deaf-mutes at Hartford, the question arose how much they should pay for each child per year. The Directors suggested to the Commissioners to name some sum which they deemed reasonable. This they declined to do, but referred the matter back to the Directors. They mentioned the sum of one hundred and fifteen dollars as sufficient, with the income of the fund, to pay expenses. The Commissioners acknowledged that this amount was smaller than they should have named themselves, and smaller, also, than they should have been perfectly willing to pay. This sum continued to be the amount paid from 1825 until 1834. The Directors then found that they could afford to still further reduce this charge for instruction, and they reduced it down to one hundred dollars, at which point it remained until 1863. All this while, gentlemen, the expenses of the institution for the education and care of these children were from one hundred and eighty to two hundred dollars a head. Of course, the

balance was made up from the funds of the institution. The State of Rhode Island came into this arrangement in 1842, and all these States have continued in it until the present time. The institution completes its fiftieth year on the 15th of April next.

On the part of the Directors, gentlemen, the arrangement which was entered into at that time has been carried out in good faith and in an excellent spirit. They have provided most liberally for the instruction of these children. They have obtained able men as instructors, who could command, anywhere, a large rate of compensation, and they have been obliged to pay a large rate of compensation. They have taken care of the health of the pupils, of their morals, of their manners, and everything of that sort. They have, for many years past, had three matrons,—one matron and two assistants,—who have had the charge of the internal department; two stewards,—one steward and an assistant; they have given the pupils a good healthy diet, and have also provided shops and tools for their instruction in trades, at considerable expense. This arrangement has been, apparently, mutually satisfactory. We have had, very frequently, visits from high State officials,—Governors, members of the Council, Secretaries of State; and from this State we have had the pleasure very frequently of seeing the Governor and members of the Council, and also members of the Legislative Committee on Charitable Institutions. They have come unannounced, but we have been very happy to see them, and they have had every opportunity to examine the progress of the children and the care that is taken of them. These gentlemen have expressed themselves abundantly satisfied that the children were well taught and well cared for in every particular. Then the parents of these children have been satisfied with the care they have received, and also with the improvement they have made; the pupils themselves have been happy, contented and cheerful; so that all round, this arrangement has been very satisfactory, so far as I have known.

I mentioned that the institution is just about closing its fiftieth year. We have instructed, in all, about 1,700 children, including the number at present in the institution. Of these 1,700, 515 (including also the children in the institution at the present time) have been from Massachusetts; and of the 515, 486 have received aid from the State. These children have received a fair education, as we think. They are scattered over your State now. You will not find them in your Reform Schools, your Almshouses, or your State Prison; you will find them about among the community, earning their living, respectable and respected members of the community; as a general thing, with scarcely an exception, through the influence of the education they have obtained at Hartford.

It is now proposed, gentlemen, to change this relation, and to educate your children somewhere else. I wish you to understand fully the views of the Directors of the Hartford institution and of the gentlemen connected with it on this subject. They have, as I have said, considered this institution a New England institution. The Directors have managed its fund judiciously and successfully, never having lost a dollar of it, for the benefit of the deaf-mutes of New England. It has been ample for this purpose, and will be for the present. I do not believe in a large, over-crowded institution, any more than Dr. Howe does. We want a certain number to get the two points which Dr. Howe suggests,—classification, in its best form, and economy; and we want an institution no larger than those two points demand. The deaf-mutes in New England now hit just about that point. In our judgment, we want from 225 to 250 pupils to instruct them in the best way. It gives us the best facilities for classification, and also meets the other point, economy, as near as we can. We have an annual addition of from 35 to 40, and with from 35 to 40 new children annually coming in, we are enabled to effect, in a good degree, this very important measure of classification. You can put those who are dull and backward and require special and careful instruction together, and the children who are brighter and who can make more rapid progress can be put together, to the mutual advantage of both classes. Whereas, if you have only 17 or 18 coming in, they must all go together into one class, and the bright ones be kept back by the dull ones, and the dull ones be very much vexed by the more rapid progress of their companions. We find this matter a very important practical point in our instruction.

This arrangement has been mutually satisfactory, as I have said, and almost entirely so, to the officers of the institution and the citizens of Massachusetts and of the different New England States, and they have had abundant opportunity to find out whether their children were properly instructed and cared for. These public officers come there and see the children; the parents visit them very frequently and spend the night, sometimes two or three nights, and the children go home in vacation; so there is abundant opportunity to ascertain whether the parents are pleased or not.

Dr. Howe has never liked this arrangement. I speak with all respect and courtesy for the doctor. He has not liked this arrangement for 35 years, and during all that time he has endeavored, very fairly and very properly, to have the children removed from Hartford and instructed elsewhere. I make no imputations whatever with regard to Dr. Howe. Of course he is sincere and conscientious in believing that he can teach deaf-mutes better than they are taught at Hartford, and is conscientious in endeavoring to carry out his views of the peculiar methods of instruc-

tion which he puts forth as being better than ours. His efforts are to advance the welfare of humanity, and it has been perfectly fair for him to express his own views, and to exert whatever influence he possesses to have them carried out. I do not question his sincerity. His sympathies go out for the unfortunate. He has the blind and the idiotic under his care, and he thinks if he had the deaf-mutes also, their interests would be advanced. But we think he is mistaken; and although he has brought these views before Committees of the Legislature for many years, he has never yet succeeded in making them believe his views correct, or induced them to take the action he desired.

What are the objections which these gentlemen make to the institution at Hartford, or the reasons which they give for wishing their children removed? I was very much interested this morning in the views which gentlemen brought forward with regard to articulation. This is not a new question at all. The gentlemen who have instructed deaf-mutes are perfectly familiar with it. They have considered it over and over again, and right in the face of all these instances of success which gentlemen have brought forward, the instruction of deaf-mutes wherever they are taught the English language, is carried on just as we carry it on now. They have brought forward nothing new at all. These very things we have met time and time again. At first, it was the general impression that these children should be taught entirely by articulation; it was supposed that there was some mysterious power in human speech. The first advocates of articulation had this idea: that you could not teach an idea by a written word or by a sign, but only by the vocal utterance of words. That was Heinicke's theory. Subsequent experience has shown that all that amounts to nothing; that we can just as well and just as distinctly teach ideas by signs to deaf-mutes as by vocal or written words. That was the Abbé de l'Épée's method, and the foundation of his system. But Mr. Braidwood, of Edinburgh, adopted this system of articulation. He was the most accomplished articulator the world has ever seen; but at that time, sensible men saw that there were serious objections to this method of teaching. They saw that there was very great difficulty in teaching, and that success was problematical.

Allow me to read a single paragraph from Dugald Stewart, in reference to this matter. He was perfectly acquainted with Braidwood's experiments, and saw what he did; and his opinion, as a man of sound judgment, ought to have weight on a question of this kind. In his account of James Mitchell, a boy born blind and deaf, published in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Vol. 7, p. 39, he says:—

“But Sicard’s aim was of a different, and of a higher nature; not to astonish the vulgar by the sudden conversion of a dumb child into a speaking *automaton*; but, by affording scope to those means which nature herself has provided for the gradual evolution of our intellectual powers, to convert his pupil into a rational and moral being.”

Again, he says:—

“I have been led to insist at some length on the philosophical merits of Sicard’s plan of instruction for the dumb, not only because his fundamental principles admit of an obvious application (*mutatis mutandis*) to the case of Mitchell; but because his book does not seem to have attracted so much notice in this country as might have been expected, among those who have devoted themselves to the same profession. Of this no stronger proof can be procured than the stress which has been laid, by most of our teachers, on the power of articulation, which can rarely, if ever, repay to a person born deaf, the time and pains necessary for the acquisition. This error was, no doubt, owing, in the first instance, to a very natural, though a very gross mistake, which confounds the gift of speech with the gift of reason; but I believe it has been prolonged and confirmed in England, not a little, by the common union of this branch of *trade* with the more lucrative one of professing to cure organical impediments. To teach the dumb to speak, besides, (although, in fact, entitled to rank only a little higher than the art of training starlings and parrots,) will always appear to the multitude a far more wonderful feat of ingenuity than to unfold silently the latent capacities of the understanding; an effect which is not, like the other, palpable to sense, and of which but a few are able either to ascertain the existence, or to appreciate the value. It is not surprising, therefore, that even those teachers who are perfectly aware of the truth of what I have now stated should persevere in the difficult, but comparatively useless attempt, of imparting to their pupils that species of accomplishment which is to furnish the only scale upon which the success of their labors is ever likely to be measured by the public.”

These are the opinions of Dugald Stewart, as expressed at that time. They must go for what they are worth. The fact is, that the schools in England and Scotland, without exception, embracing the opinions of Braidwood, commenced teaching the deaf-mutes to articulate, supposing that was the only way. The fact also is, that after giving this system a long, faithful and conclusive trial, they have abandoned it for the system of L’Epée—teaching the deaf-mutes by their natural language, the language of signs. It is very evident that Englishmen will never copy anything that a Frenchman does unless there is a very good reason for it; but this system they did adopt, and now there is no single institution in England that teaches articulation, except the London institution, and it is well known that a very large number of their pupils do not learn articulation.

We have not taken something that happened to be dropped down upon us, and pursued it blindly, without knowing why; but we have taken

this system of educating the deaf and dumb because, by careful investigation of the experiments made in Germany and France, we find it is the best way of relieving the deaf and dumb from his misfortune. He is unfortunate; he has lost his hearing. That is the only reason why he is unfortunate; but how great is that misfortune! Our object is to relieve him as far as possible from that misfortune, and restore him to society; and our simple question, with reference to the method of instruction, is, How can this best be done? That is certainly a practical question, and on the solution of this question, we are entirely ready to decide this whole matter. How can the deaf-mute be best relieved from his misfortune and restored to society and to his friends? There are two points to be noticed. You want to effect two things. The fact is, that the deafness of a child leaves his mind in perfect ignorance. The things that other children of his age know, he knows nothing about. He has no means, either, of communicating with his friends. We want to give him two things: a medium of communication with his friends, with society, with everybody; we want also to open his mind to instruction. We want to lay open to him the knowledge of books, so that he can for himself investigate; and when we have done these two things, if we have *perfectly* given him communication with the world around him, if we have *perfectly* educated him, his misfortune is gone. But we do not find any system which will do that; we do not find any system of instruction that will take these deaf children out of their misfortune; they are unfortunate still. What system will give these children relief to the utmost possible extent? That is the point we want to decide, and certainly, if one system will do it better than another, adopt it by all means. If articulation will enlighten their minds more rapidly and restore them to their friends and society more perfectly than signs, then take articulation; we want to be convinced of that fact. On the other hand, if signs, the natural language of the deaf and dumb (making use of them for no other purpose than to draw out the minds of deaf and dumb people)—if these succeed best, why not take the best? Take the course that will educate the most of these children, and educate them most perfectly. That is the point upon which this question turns, with practical men.

We have investigated this subject five different times. In the first place, Mr Gallaudet, whose whole life shows him to have been a man of keen mind and practical judgment, in introducing a system of instruction into the country, selected the method of signs. He saw what articulation could do at Edinburgh and London. When he was there, the schools were taught entirely on that system. He also saw what the instruction was in France; and, although there was some difficulty in regard to his obtaining a knowledge of the system pursued in England,

yet, if he had perceived that that was the way to instruct the deaf and dumb, there was no difficulty that could not have been overcome. He would simply have been obliged to spend some little time in a school in England as a scholar, and he would have done so cheerfully. But he saw the system of signs was much more effective, and selected that. He went on under that system for some years, and succeeded in educating a large number of deaf-mutes in a manner satisfactory to them and to their friends. The graduates of the institution were scattered over New England, relieved, to a very great extent, of the pressure of their misfortune. In 1844, Mr. Mann and Dr. Howe were abroad; and Mr. Mann said in one of his reports, that the schools for deaf-mutes in this country were very far behind those of Germany. Mr. Mann was a gentleman of very positive opinions, and he put this forth in a very positive manner. It was something that concerned us. The only object of the Hartford gentlemen, from the beginning, was to instruct the deaf and dumb in the best way; and they said, "If we have got the wrong system, let us find the best one." Mr. Mann, I think, had never been at the Hartford institution; I doubt whether he had ever been in any American institution; at all events, he must, beyond question, have been very imperfectly acquainted with the system of instruction pursued in the American asylums; yet he said the deaf-mutes of Germany were relieved very much more from their misfortune than deaf-mutes in this country. He spoke of meeting deaf and dumb persons who could talk very well, and who would not be suspected to be deaf-mutes until after they had been conversing some little time. There is no question about that fact. There is no question but that they were just such persons as Mr. Chamberlain who appeared before you. There is a large class who have never lost articulation, but who have lost their hearing. These gentlemen came in contact with some of this class, beyond any question, and it was Mr. Mann's opinion, and he put it forth very strongly in his report, that our instruction was far behind that of Germany. The Directors of the Hartford institution wanted to be convinced whether that was the fact or not, and they immediately sent the Principal of the institution abroad to find out, not whether the Hartford institution was instructing in the best way, but what was the best way. The New York institution sent out at the same time Prof. Day, a gentleman who had formerly been a teacher of the deaf and dumb, and was a proficient in the German, French, and Dutch languages. These gentlemen went abroad, but went in different courses. Their methods of investigation were entirely independent of each other. They looked into this matter carefully, inquiring, in the first place, to what extent the German institutions were able to teach the children merely to talk? What proportion of the deaf and dumb did they educate? Could they

restore articulation to all of them? To what extent were the pupils able to converse with their friends and with strangers so as to be understood by them? How long they retained their articulation? All these were practical points, and these gentlemen made very careful inquiries in regard to them. When they came back they published their investigations, giving, so far as was courteous, the names of the schools, and all the minute data. They reported, that while the American institutions had very much to learn from their German brethren in regard to their admirable patience, their perseverance and persistency in accomplishing their work, yet, so far as methods of instruction were concerned, so far as results were concerned, we had nothing to learn; that we were far ahead of them; that the pupils of the German schools were far less intelligent than ours; that a very large number of these children were rejected, because they said they could not educate them. Mr. Weld, speaking in regard to the institution at Zurich, says that "the usual number selected from among the annual applicants is not more than one-fourth or one-third of the whole, varying in different years." Out of the twelve who applied that year, only four were selected. Probably this proportion was smaller than in very many institutions; but they made their selections very carefully indeed, rejecting quite a number because their facilities for articulation were not good. That was the reason given. The London institution did this also; and they did it on the ground that if a child could not be taught articulation, it was evidence of a weak mind. And not only was this selection very carefully made, but these gentlemen found that after the selection was made, quite an important number of these children were dropped as being impracticable—they could not teach them. The fact is, that only about one-fourth of those who were admitted made any great progress in instruction.

This was in 1844. These gentlemen found, on investigation (what was known before), that the two classes of children that these German teachers instructed, and with whom was their great success, were, first, that class of children who had not lost their hearing entirely, and, secondly, that large class of children who had lost their hearing after they learned to speak, and had never lost their articulation. These two classes were the children with whom they had their great success; whereas, with those born deaf and dumb, and those who lost their hearing before they began to speak, they made but very little progress.

The CHAIRMAN. How long had this experiment been tried?

Mr. STONE. Ever since 1755. I think the school was commenced in that year. Heinicke died in 1790.

Dr. Peet, President of the New York institution, went abroad in 1851, I think, and took two educated deaf-mutes with him, and his own

son. He visited all the prominent institutions in France, Germany, Prussia, Switzerland, Italy, and all Eastern Europe. He found no pupils who were, in his judgment, anything like so well educated or so intelligent as those he took with him. The general standard of deaf-mute education seemed to him to be much lower, and for reasons which I will state presently.

In 1858, Professor Day was going abroad again, and it having been said in some quarters that there had been new discoveries made with regard to this method of articulation,—that it had been some fifteen or twenty years since this subject was investigated, and during that time new methods had been devised and progress made,—the Directors of the New York institution requested him to go over this ground again. He did so; and I would like to read the conclusions to which he came after this second visit, which was the fourth time the subject was investigated :—

“1. No new arguments or reasons in favor of teaching deaf-mutes to articulate and read upon the lips have been advanced.

“2. It is not pretended that recent improvements or discoveries have been made, by which the teaching of articulation to deaf-mutes has become easier or more generally successful than formerly.

“3. The exaggerated reports of success in teaching mechanical articulation, which appear from time to time, arise from the imperfect acquaintance with the subject of casual visitors. The performances of a few select pupils, who, in most cases, lost their hearing after having once learned to speak, they erroneously suppose to be fair specimens of the average results obtained.

“4. A certain portion of deaf-mutes may, with a sufficient expenditure of time and labor, be taught, with more or less advantage, to articulate mechanically, and to read upon the lips.

“5. This class consists of semi-mutes, mutes who became deaf having once learned to speak, and now and then those who possess special aptitude, mentally and physically, for this kind of instruction.

“6. The proportion of this class is variously estimated at from one-fifth to one-tenth of the whole number. Of twenty-seven pupils admitted into the Paris institution in October, 1856, six, or nearly one-fifth, had lost their hearing between the ages of four and seven years, and, of course, after having learned more or less to talk. Of seventy-nine pupils admitted in the May preceding, twelve, or one-sixth and seven-twelfths, became deaf at periods varying from three to seven years of age. Of these, two were half deaf and one but slightly deaf. Of 287 pupils received into the school at Bordeaux, thirty-eight, or about one-seventh and three-eighths, became deaf between the ages of three and eight years. A portion of these, however, were found, in consequence of mental feebleness, incapable of receiving instruction, with profit, in artificial articulation.

“7. The actual degree of success obtained, in teaching articulation and reading on the lips to deaf-mutes of this class, varies exceedingly. In many cases it is represented as deriving its chief value from the increased intelli-

bility which a few words and sentences impart to the natural language of signs.

"8. The instances of remarkable success are comparatively rare. In nearly every case it is found on inquiry to be conditioned upon the possession of the power of hearing till an advanced period of childhood. The work actually accomplished is the restoration, to a certain degree, of the partially disused power of speaking.

"9. The ability obtained by the few who comprise this latter class, to use articulate language and to read upon the lips, although exceedingly valuable, is attended with serious limitations. To represent those who made the most progress as standing on a level with those who hear and speak, and able to take part, without restraint, in the general intercourse of society, is a palpable exaggeration. Their speaking is monotonous and harsh, and, in order to be understood, requires fixed attention, which soon becomes fatiguing. A greater difficulty, however, arises from the inevitable embarrassment experienced by the deaf-mute in endeavoring to understand those who speak solely from the motion of the lips and vocal organs. The case has been well stated by Professor Vaisse, [who is a distinguished professor in the Paris institution. He was for four years a professor in the New York institution. He is a man of large scientific attainments, and has published articles in the French Cyclopædias on this subject.] He observes that all the sounds of the language admit of being recognized either by sight or touch. Both of these are employed in the same rooms. In ordinary conversation, however, the deaf-mute is wholly excluded from the latter resource, and is obliged to supply its place 'by a calculation of probabilities which nearly amounts to divination.' He is constantly engaged in a process of conjecture while reading upon the lips, and is forced to make out the letters which cannot be determined from the visible motion of the vocal organs by those which can. Whether the letter *b*, for instance, is *b*, *p* or *m*, the pronunciation of which, to the eye, appears alike, he is obliged to decide, as well as he can, from attendant circumstances. [I will not go through with these difficulties, which are very numerous.]

"10. With the exception of the class already mentioned—that is to say, in the case of the great majority of deaf-mutes—instruction in mechanical articulation is attended with too little benefit to compensate for the serious sacrifices made in attempting it. It is a great mistake to suppose that the chief end to be obtained, in the education of deaf-mutes, is to enable them to converse with others."

I think our friends who favor articulation dwell almost entirely upon this as a medium of communication with society. We regard the intellectual cultivation as the most important of the two. Both are important. Prof. Day recommends precisely what we practice in Hartford, that effort should be given to retaining the articulation of those who have not entirely lost their hearing, and also the articulation of children who have learned to speak before they lost their hearing. This is precisely what we have done for the last thirty years, and do now. He says:—

“Beyond this, unless new discoveries should hereafter be made, which should place the subject in an entirely different light, no serious change in the American system of deaf-mute instruction, the whole fruits of which are so widely conferred and admired, should be contemplated for a moment. The principle in which it rests is right; the processes on which it depends are in accordance with sound philosophy; and the results those which have given our institutions a name and rank second to none.”

This, gentlemen, is the conclusion to which Prof. Day came after his second examination of the subject; really the fifth which has been made.

Mr. TURNER. I would like to say one single word in explanation. Mr. Day, at this time, was not a teacher of the deaf and dumb, or in any way connected with any institution, nor had he been for some years. He was an entirely independent and disinterested witness, therefore. Though in early life he was a professor in a deaf and dumb institution, and knew what the system was, yet at this time he was a theological professor in Lane Seminary, in Ohio, or connected with some other literary institution.

Dr. STONE. Prof. Day was peculiarly qualified for these investigations, by the very fact that he was so entirely familiar with the German language. I think Dr. Howe states that Mr. Mann was not familiar with German. Prof. Day is perfectly familiar with the German language—speaks it, reads it, writes it; and is also familiar with the French and Dutch languages.

Adjourned to Tuesday, February 5th, at 9½, A. M.

THIRD HEARING.

TUESDAY, February 5.

The Committee met at 9½ o'clock, and Rev. Mr. STONE resumed his address. He said:—

Mr. Chairman,—When I last had the pleasure of addressing the Committee, I remarked on one or two points, which I should like to suggest again. One was, that this calamity of deafness presses upon the deaf-mute in two directions. It leaves his mind in entire ignorance, and also shuts him off from communication with society. These are the two particulars in which this deafness afflicts him. We find that medical science can do very little to relieve him. There is scarcely an instance on record in which medical science has been able to give permanent relief to a congenital deaf-mute. The only way in which he can be relieved is by education. We find that he can be relieved by that, and to such an extent, that we can say, the substance of the affliction is removed, and merely the shadow remains. Two systems have been proposed for the alleviation of this great calamity; one educating the deaf-mute in his natural language, the language of signs, and by that, bringing him into contact with the language we use, and teaching him the language of society and the language of books; the other endeavoring to restore his lost speech. It is very evident, that the system which we should adopt should be the one which relieves the individual deaf-mute most completely, and, also, the greatest number. There is no question about that principle. Now, these two systems have been tried for over one hundred years, and there is abundant opportunity for intelligent men to ascertain by the practical results, which is the best; which does secure the end desired in the best way. These results are open to the world. I remarked yesterday, that the system which we practice is not one dropped down upon us accidentally, and which we blindly follow. It is one chosen, retained and pursued from our profound conviction that it is the best system that can be adopted for the relief of the deaf and dumb—the one which does actually bring him most completely out of his misfortune. I remarked also, yesterday, that this question had been investigated at five different times, by the most competent men to prosecute such an investigation in the country, and it is wonderful how almost exactly their conclusions coincide. Mr. Weld had the company of two distinguished deaf-mute teachers. Prof. Vaisse, quite distinguished as a scientific man, and Prof.

Morel, the editor of the "Annals of the Deaf and Dumb." These gentlemen accompanied him, and all their conclusions agreed. I will read a paragraph from a letter that Prof. Morel wrote to Mr. Weld, after his return to this country, to show what those conclusions were :—

"From the observations which we ourselves made in the German schools, and from those which Messrs. Day and Weld made, we are sustained in saying, that one-third only of the pupils become skilful enough in speaking and in reading on the lips, to derive advantage from the oral lessons of the teacher, and to carry on communication with others by means of oral language; a second third succeed in uttering articulations and in reading them on the lips, only in a painful, confusing and imperfect manner, and renounce this mode of intercourse for signs and writing, or, at most, pronounce only a few single words; and with the last third, the results are of no possible value in the education and prospects of the pupils. Now let us see to what these results are reduced. We stated above, that one-tenth of the deaf-mutes presented for admission into the German schools, were rejected before any trial; that of those admitted, one-fifth were sent away as incapable of instruction; and of those retained in the institution, hardly a third make sufficient progress in speaking to enable them to use oral language in the interchangé of ideas. Thus a third of four-fifths of nine-tenths is the number of deaf-mutes who really succeed in speaking; less than one-fourth; and it is to arrive at such a result that the German teachers sacrifice the most essential parts of education."

In 1847, there was a convention of German teachers, and those gentlemen, referring to the reports of Prof. Day and Mr. Weld, made in 1844, which had at that time been printed and returned to Germany, accepted, as a general thing, the conclusions of these gentlemen. They say, although these gentlemen were foreigners, although they were not friends of our system of instruction, yet, inasmuch as they were competent men, inasmuch as they agreed so almost entirely in their observations, it becomes us to consider very carefully the system of instruction we are pursuing.

Another observation which these gentlemen made, it is worth while to notice. They found that the pupils of the German institutions lacked that appearance of intelligence which the pupils of American institutions have. This was very marked; and the reason which they give for it, and which the German teachers comment upon, is, that the great strength of the German teachers is spent upon this method of obtaining communications by speech, whereas the great strength of the teachers in American institutions is spent directly upon enlightening the mind. The result which these gentlemen came to, as I stated yesterday, was, that while we had very much to learn from our German brethren, in the way of infinite patience and persistency, we had very little to learn from them as respects the methods of instruction.

But we have, fortunately, a method of testing these two systems nearer home. There is at the deaf-mute college at Washington, one of these German pupils, who was educated at Pforzheim; there are, also, pupils there from the Hartford Asylum; and it occurred to the Principal of the college to put certain questions to this German pupil, and to one of the Hartford pupils, to test the results of the systems of education pursued at the two places. He wrote eleven questions, which were placed in the hands of each of them, and were answered. There was such a similarity in the external circumstances of these young men, that the result is worth noting. This German youth, for two years past in the Columbia Institution, was first instructed in the institute at Pforzheim, which has been in existence forty years, and is one of the most distinguished for its system of articulation. The following questions were put to him, in writing, to elicit information in regard to the course of instruction followed at Pforzheim, and its results:—

“ Q. 1. At what age did you become deaf?

A. I became deaf from sickness when I was nine years of age.

Q. 2. Had you learned to speak before you became deaf?

A. I had learned to speak as a child speaks before I became deaf.

Q. 3. How long were you in school at Pforzheim?

A. I was in school at Pforzheim four years. I entered when I was twelve years of age.

Q. 4. What did you study while there?

A. My studies were the Scriptural catechism, geography, arithmetic, (the first four rules,) and articulation.

Q. 5. How much time each day did you spend studying articulation?

A. The first and second years I spent half an hour each day; the third and fourth years I spent two hours a day.

Q. 6. Can you make your family friends understand what you wish to by speaking with your lips?

A. Yes, sir; pretty well.

Q. 7. Do strangers understand what you say to them with your mouth?

A. No, sir; I often find it necessary to write to them.

Q. 8. Can you read easily from the lips of strangers?

A. No, sir.

Q. 9. Can you understand what is said by the minister in church or by a public speaker?

A. No, sir; not in the least.

Q. 10. At Pforzheim did your teachers and schoolmates commonly converse with you with the mouth, or by signs?

A. Each of my teachers and schoolmates naturally talked to me by signs.

Q. 11. How did you generally talk to them?

A. I generally talk to them by making signs.

“ The first nine questions above given were also placed in the hands of an American youth, named Parkinson, with the single change in the third question of the word Pforzheim to Hartford. The answers which follow were furnished in writing, and are copied verbatim:—

A. 1. At the age of eight years and ten months.

A. 2. I had learned to speak as well as children usually do when nine years of age.

A. 3. I entered the Hartford school when I was twelve, and remained three years.

A. 4. I studied arithmetic, English history, geography, natural philosophy, English grammar, anatomy, Latin and the history of the United States.

A. 5. Fifteen minutes to half an hour, daily, for the first year only.

A. 6. I can, quite easily.

A. 7. By speaking slowly I am generally able to make them understand.

A. 8. No, sir; not at all.

A. 9. No, sir.

"It will be noticed, upon a comparison of the answers of these young men that both belong to the class termed semi-mutes; that both lost their hearing at about the age of nine years; that both had learned to speak before becoming deaf; that both entered their respective schools at the age of twelve. Up to the time, therefore, of their coming under instruction in the special institutions, their advantages and disadvantages were evenly balanced. One remained at Pforzheim four years; the other at Hartford three. The German youth, then, should have more to show as the result of his instructions than the other. Let us see if this is the case, looking first at the matter of articulation, which is the specialty of the German schools.

"Kaufmann was taught what would be equivalent to five hours a day for one year. Parkinson received but a half-hour's tuition daily, for one year. And yet, on comparing the answers to questions six, seven, eight, and nine, we find the latter surpassing the former in his facility of oral utterance, while in the ability to read from the lips of others the German has no advantage over the American.

"We are, therefore, forced to the notable conclusion that *even in articulation*, the crowning glory of the German method, and with a boy who spoke until he was nine years of age, the results attained are not equal to those reached with a boy similarly circumstanced, who had only the advantages furnished in the Hartford school, where, in the words of a somewhat prominent critic, 'The friends of the system of articulation do not believe it ever can have a fair trial, because the managers have the whole power in their hands, and being honestly and firmly wedded to the old system, will feel obliged to adhere to it.'—*Second Annual Report of the Massachusetts Board of State Charities, Boston, 1866.*

"The same authority makes the following sweeping assertion: 'If our mutes, educated at Hartford, had been taught articulation, and taught as well as children are taught in the German schools, they might attend public worship in our churches; they would all partake the common spirit of religious devotion, (which public worship does so much to strengthen;) most of them would seize the sense and meaning of the services and sermon; and the intelligent ones would catch enough of the very words of the preacher to understand his discourse. This statement is not made hastily or thoughtlessly.' And yet Kaufmann, when asked if he could understand what is said by a minister in church or by a public speaker, replies, 'Not in the least;' which somewhat conflicts with the idea advanced above.

"Turning, now from the subject of articulation, let us compare in the two cases under review the results of their courses of study in other particulars.

"The time appropriated in Kaufmann's case to the branches deemed important in the education of youth was only sufficient to give him an imperfect knowledge of the four ground rules of arithmetic, a little geography, and Scripture lessons; while Parkinson went thoroughly over the whole of arithmetic, algebra to quadratic equations, giving considerable attention to geography, history, grammar, natural philosophy and anatomy, and taking a daily exercise in Latin for nearly a year.

"Parkinson on coming here a year since, was able to enter the freshman class in the college.

"Kaufman, having gained a good knowledge of English during his two years' stay in this institution, has still to spend two years, at least, in preparing to enter the college.

"If those who have followed this article thus far will accept the testimony of these young men as reliable; and our statement that both have more than ordinary intelligence, further argument is unnecessary to prove what was claimed in the outset as to the comparative merits of the German and American systems."

This testimony comes to our hands without any effort of our own. It is the testimony of the Principal of the Deaf-Mute College at Washington, in a report recently issued.

MR. DUDLEY. Is anything said about the comparative capacity of the two young men?

MR. STONE. He says they are both unusually bright children. Indeed, it would be hardly possible for these two young men to prepare to enter the Deaf-Mute College, if they were not young men of more than ordinary intelligence.

I stated yesterday that although all the English institutions commenced by teaching articulation, they had all abandoned it, with the exception of the London Asylum. They all (with that exception,) teach as we teach—by signs; taking the natural language of the deaf and dumb, and paying attention to semi-mutes just as we do. The London Asylum has always, on principle, done somewhat different. They *profess* to teach by articulation.

MR. SANBORN. I would like to ask if Mr. Stone is well-informed when he states that all the English institutions began by teaching articulation; and whether those established since 1840, of which there are five or six, began by teaching articulation?

MR. STONE. I mean the old institutions.

MR. SANBORN. Those were very few—the London, Edinburgh and Manchester.

MR. STONE. I have here some testimony in regard to articulation at the London institution. It is testimony, not from a German or an American, but from an Englishman—the editor of the *Christian Observer*; and is as reliable testimony as we could expect to get:—

"It is a notorious fact, and it argues no want of care in the teachers, that the great body of deaf-mutes never do or can learn to speak so as to make use of their faculty for the ordinary purposes of human intercourse. Even the few picked scholars who after great labor are taught to recite a passage for public exhibition, do not generally converse by means of oral sounds. From this observation, we do not except even the best instructed of those deaf-mutes, who are annually exhibited at the City of London Tavern, and who, we conclude, are the greatest proficient in articulation. The uncouth, unnatural, and often unintelligible sounds to which they give utterance, convey pain rather than gratification to others."

I do not know, gentlemen, how we can obtain more direct and stronger testimony in regard to the results of the system of articulation, in those institutions where it is made a speciality, than that which I have submitted. Certainly, the gentlemen whose opinions I have quoted to you, are as competent to judge in this matter as any who can be found, and their conclusions, as I have said, entirely coincide.

We allow that deaf-mutes, in isolated cases, can be taught to articulate—congenital deaf-mutes. There are certain specific cases, one, perhaps, in a hundred, where there is a peculiar flexibility of the organs, and a peculiar quickness of mind, in which, with great pains and labor, they can be taught to articulate. But, even in these cases, they cannot be taught so as to be restored in any sense to society. They are not taught so that we do not know they are deaf and dumb. Some have been taught so that, if you stand in front of them, a little distance off, and speak very distinctly,—not, by any means, as I speak to you,—they can understand what you say, and they can speak to you intelligibly. But these instances are very few; and in order to reach these results, which we hold to be very imperfect, the labor is immense. This is a very important point in regard to this system of instruction. The labor which is required to teach these children to speak is immense beyond our conception. Then the results, as I say, are exceedingly imperfect. In the first place, it is very problematical whether the intonations of the child will be such that you can bear to hear them at all. The fact that the utterance of the mouth is not at all governed by the ear, that there is no regulation whatever of the quantity of sound exploded, makes this matter one of perfect hap-hazard. You cannot tell whether the intonations of the child will be pleasant or unpleasant; whether the sound he emits will be a screech or a whisper; and the fact is, that it is very rare that these intonations are agreeable. Sometimes they are pleasant, but in many instance they are very unpleasant indeed. It is so in the case of semi-mutes. After they have lost their hearing, they are unable to modulate their voice, and aware of this, persons who are sensitive and refined, are very unwilling to use their voice. Dr. Kitto was one of these instances. He could talk very

well, but, knowing that he had not the ability to modulate his voice, he would not talk in society, but confined himself to communicating in another way ; with children, he would talk.

While there are these few cases that can be taught, with labor enough, we hold that it is an undeniable fact, that the great mass of deaf-mutes, with any amount of labor and effort, cannot be taught articulation. The German teachers allow this just as fully as we do. What proportion of deaf-mutes can be taught to articulate? The German teachers say it ranges from one-fifth to one-tenth. A professor in the London Institution told Professor Day that not one-fourth of the children in that institution could learn articulation. This was his own testimony. And another testimony, stronger still, is that of a teacher who had been employed in the London Institution for twenty years, who, on being transferred to the Claremont Institution, where they taught by signs, as we do, was asked by the directors, "Would you introduce the system of the London Institution here?" His reply was, "By no means."

There is one other point on which I wish to speak before leaving this subject of articulation, and that is, its effect upon the health. We allow that the natural use of the lungs is conducive to health ; but it is a very different matter where we call the lungs to an *unnatural* use. It was asserted by medical men, that bronchitis, which was so serious a disease among clergymen, was caused by the fact that clergymen generally read their sermons, and there is not that sympathy between the voice and the mind which is necessary to render the utterance free and easy ; and it was said distinctly, that orators who speak in the open air, and speak without notes, were seldom troubled with bronchitis. Now, this action of the lungs is entirely unnatural, so far as the deaf-mute is concerned. He hears no sound. He is required to explode these sounds, of course without any sympathy from his mind, and we find that it is very straining upon the nerves. We have evidence upon this subject which is very distinct. Of course, this is a very important point with regard to our German brethren, and they would be very glad to show that their system does not have an unfavorable effect ; but the most they can say is, that upon the whole the effect is not unfavorable. Still, statistics hardly show that. Professor Day says :—

"To my surprise, I find that no statistics upon this subject (the unfavorable effect of articulation upon deaf-mutes) have ever been collected ; and that what is so confidently brought forward as an established fact, is nothing but a presumption, drawn from the general rule that strength is imparted to an organ by exercise. The general rule no one will deny ; but whether it applies in the present case may admit of question. The unusual tendency of the deaf and dumb to disease of the lungs does not arise wholly, nor perhaps mainly, from

the want of exercise of the vocal organs, but from the scrofulous habit which so strongly characterizes them. Aside, therefore, from the exercise or rest of the vocal organs, the germ of consumption, in many cases, already lies in the constitution, ready often to be developed by the slightest cause. Exercise may save, but exercise, too, may destroy. Whether it is not in many cases, to say the least, a hazardous experiment, suddenly to awaken the lungs from their long slumber, and lay upon them, in all their weakness, the severe labor of mechanical articulation, with the constant and visible exhaustion it demands, is a question not to be met by referring to general rules. At least, as the case now stands, no one is authorized to affirm that articulation has a tendency to prevent pulmonary disease. Of the most experienced and judicious teachers I have met in Germany, some contented themselves with observing that they could not say they had seen any injurious consequence; while others admitted that if, in some cases, it had a tendency to strengthen, in others also it had a tendency to irritate the lungs; and that therefore, on the whole, no argument in favor of articulation could fairly be drawn from its sanitary effects."

We say, it is unnatural. If you have ever seen any efforts made to instruct deaf-mutes, even bright children, so as to enable them to enunciate sounds, you have seen that it is very straining, very wearing, and of course entirely artificial, entirely mechanical. We must remember that words have no meaning to deaf-mutes; that they have to use words without associating them with ideas. The first idea in the instruction of deaf-mutes was, that vocal sounds were the only things that could be associated with ideas; that you could not think, except by associating your thoughts with vocal sounds; and this is the fallacy, as we conceive, of the brethren who instruct by articulation. The German teachers do not hold that idea now, and we know it is entirely erroneous. The deaf-mute has no idea in connection with the sound he utters. Words represent ideas to us by an entirely artificial association—simply because we have agreed that that word shall represent that idea; not because it means that idea. Now, it is a great deal more natural for deaf-mutes to associate ideas with signs—which mean something, many of them—than with words. These signs are eclectic, and mean something to them; whereas words are perfectly meaningless, so far as they are concerned.

I was saying, that we teach, and have always taught, articulation to two classes of children: those who lost their hearing after they learned to speak, and retain their articulation still, and those who have not entirely lost their hearing. There is a class of deaf-mutes who learned to speak before they lost their hearing; they became entirely deaf, but they have not forgotten how to speak now—have not lost their articulation. Then there is another class who have not lost their hearing entirely. Of course, they could talk before they became deaf and dumb, and they can hear the words you speak to them, when you speak close

to their ear. All the testimony shows, that these two classes are the very classes with whom our German brethren find their great success in teaching; not with the class of congenital pupils, who get very little aid from them. They reject a great proportion without trial; of those they try, they send out a great many; and those they instruct, they do not succeed in making talk. Those who once learned to talk, and have never entirely forgotten how to articulate, and those who can hear some—these are the classes they teach to speak, and these are the classes we teach to speak. How successfully we teach them, the Committee have had an opportunity to see. The young man, Chamberlain, who has been here, had learned to talk before he lost his hearing; he came to us, and we retained his voice, improved it, and he can speak now. That was the case with Mr. Smith. His voice was very plaintive and sweet. He had not lost his articulation, and special attention was paid to it when he was at the institution. He was an interesting pupil, and I remember his being brought into the matron's room at night to repeat the 23d Psalm, which he had learned, I think, from his mother. We talked with him constantly, and gave him special instruction for a long time. By means of these efforts, his articulation was retained, and he retains it now. He can talk very well. I happened to have both these boys under my instruction, and remember their cases very well.

Well, sir, we teach still these two classes of pupils: those who learned to talk before they became deaf, and can still articulate, and those who can still hear. If they have any power of articulation, we retain it, and improve it; if they can hear at all, we retain their hearing. We have a number of these children in the institution, whom we shall be very happy to show you, if you will favor us with a visit; children who talk with us orally, but cannot hear at all, and children who have not entirely lost their hearing.

Mr. SANBORN. Will Mr. Stone inform us how large a number there is of these classes?

Mr. STONE. I should think there might be one in twenty pupils.

Mr. SANBORN. That is, about eleven in the whole institution, of these two classes?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir; those who never lost their speech, and those who can hear some.

Mr. SANBORN. There are only eleven who can be profitably taught articulation?

Mr. STONE. I think not. There is another class that perhaps could hear once—when they were two or three years old, it may be—but who have entirely lost their articulation. We do not hold that it is practicable at all to teach these children to articulate; and for this reason: their recovery of articulation costs more than it is worth. All this

labor to lead them to reproduce these vocal sounds does not teach them anything. It is simply labor on the emission of sound, and it is perfectly immense. It is only teaching these children this unnatural way of producing sound. You see how much care is required. You see how rapidly the changes are made. The deaf-mute must catch these by the eye; and, as matter of fact, the time spent in this way could be much more advantageously employed in enlightening the child's mind. We hold, and we find by experience, that it is vastly more profitable to spend the time which our friends use in teaching a child to talk, to reproduce the sounds of the language, in teaching him ideas, and cultivating his mind. This labor of teaching a child to talk is very great, and does nothing at all towards cultivating the mind of the child. It must be gone over with each individual. Sometimes day after day is spent upon one sound, and when the child is supposed to have learned it once, you have got to go over it again. It is labor simply on this artificial point—articulation. On that ground, if a child has lost his articulation entirely, and cannot hear at all, we hold that there is a better way of teaching him than by trying to teach him to talk.

This labor, Mr. Chairman, would be still more severe if we held, as some of our friends do, that the proper way to teach a child to articulate words is to disuse the finger alphabet and also natural signs. What idea does a child get of the meaning of a word by exploding it? The matter of fact is, he gets none. You may philosophize and theorize as much as you please, you cannot teach a child a thing he does not know except by something he does know. You cannot teach him something he does not know by something else that he does not know. This pointing up to a thing that is invisible, to an object that the child has never seen, gives him no idea of it at all. You have got to teach him what he does not know by what he does know; and sounds are things he does not know. Our German friends do not make this mistake. They teach articulation by signs, and they explain the meaning of words, in all cases, by signs. And not only so but they continue the use of signs almost through the whole course of instruction. Why? Because articulation does not make an idea intelligible to the child. They want to give an idea to children who have been there, perhaps, four or five years. They articulate it to them, and they accompany the words with signs that explain their meaning. They do not, as our friends would have them, fold their arms, and stand motionless; but they do as we do, and are all the time making these signs. It seems to me that the theory of our friends is a great mistake. How would you teach your little girl French? You would explain the little French words by what she knows in English, until she has learned enough of the foreign language, to enable you to explain them to her in French. How cruel, how

unreasonable it would be, if she asked you the meaning of a French word, for you to give her another French word, and insist upon her learning the meaning of the first word by the last, of which she is equally ignorant! It seems to me this is not the natural way; and the fact is, that you might just as well insist upon children's looking out of one eye, and only one eye, as to insist upon their articulating, and not using their natural signs. They will not do it. Miss Rogers says she is very careful not to give her pupils any word by signs, but to spell it out to them. Do they talk by words, when by themselves? No, they talk by signs all the time, and they will. It is unnatural to suppose that a child who understands a natural language will ignore that for any theory you have. Some of the German schools made it a positive rule that the pupils should not talk by signs, but as soon as they got out, they talked by signs. I hold that if a child can speak four or five languages, it is a great deal better than if he can speak but one. The more he can speak, the greater the intellectual stimulus. Let him speak just as many as he can. With regard to deaf-mute children, who do not know oral language, to take away their natural mode of expression is to deprive them of a great deal of satisfaction and pleasure. We think these friends would deprive the deaf-mutes of a large amount of information and enjoyment, by taking from them their natural language of signs. There were twenty or thirty deaf-mutes in the senate chamber the other day. Something was going on there. Mr. Bartlett made all these persons know what was going on there by the language of signs. If that system had not been used, there would not have been three deaf-mutes in the room who would have understood what was going on.

Our friends seem to think there is some mysterious power in articulation; but we do not find it so in practice. If I had spoken very slowly and distinctly, Mr. Chamberlain, perhaps, might have got some idea of what I said; but if I had talked as rapidly as it would have been necessary to speak in order to communicate these ideas, there would not have been three in the room who could have understood me.

This matter of signs is a very important point in the intellectual cultivation of these children. If a deaf-mute understands only articulation he understands only what is said to *him*. There is no question on that point. You have got to get within a certain distance (five feet is about the limit as the general rule, I do not speak of exceptions,) you have got to speak slowly and enunciate very carefully, you have got to have pretty distinct lips in order to have him understand. And not only that, but he has got to be familiar with your general style of speaking, and to know what you are going to say. Ask him a question on any foreign subject, and he does not know what you say. Our most accomplished articulators say, they get a little clue to what you are saying,

and guess the rest. Oral discourse, therefore, where a number of deaf-mutes are gathered together, amounts to nothing. I hold that it is entirely capable of demonstration, that with regard to altogether the largest class of deaf-mutes,—nineteen-twentieths of them,—their knowledge of signs renders them much more intelligible in society than their ability to speak. You cannot give them such facility in the use of oral language that they shall be so intelligible in society as they would be if they-used signs. A lady, for instance, has a deaf-mute servant, (and they make excellent servants.) I think experience will demonstrate that she can make that servant understand, in regard to all common matters, very much better by signs than by speaking. She has simply to point to objects, in a great many cases. She wants the room swept; she points to the floor and to the broom. She wants the dishes washed; she points to them and to the water. Ladies find no trouble in communicating with these servants in that way; whereas, in the other case, they have great difficulty in making themselves understood. Deaf-mutes do not get the ability to talk so as to be intelligible. You say something to one of them. "What?" he asks, in the most distressed tone; and you have to repeat it over and over again. It is very much easier for these children to make themselves understood by those who know nothing of the sign language, by signs than by speech. A child goes into a store to purchase something. He wants some kind of dry goods, we will suppose. He can write what he wants and show it to the clerk, or he can point it out. If he undertakes to speak, it is quite problematical whether the clerk will understand him.

Then, as I said, this labor of teaching the deaf-mute to read upon the lips is a very serious matter. It is a very difficult matter for you or for me to read on the lips what another person says; yet we have more knowledge of words, and can guess what he says. An intelligent mind can guess what he means. But the deaf-mute knows very little about language and words, and it is very much more difficult for him to read on the lips than for us. If you will try the experiment, you will find that it is very difficult, even for you. Let some person ask a simple question, such as, "How old are you?" "Where do you live?" and you will understand that; but let him say something not quite so simple, and you will find that you are very much at sea, and how little you understand of this thing.

I will not dwell longer upon this system, except to say, that a very serious objection to it is, that where it is adopted, religious worship is utterly impossible. I do not say religious *instruction* is impossible. Of course, if you have taught a deaf-mute language you can instruct him on religious subjects; but religious *worship* is out of the question. The world has never seen an instance where a person could stand up

and speak to thirty or forty deaf-mutes so that they would understand him. It is utterly out of the question. This we consider a very essential point. These signs, as I said, are electric. Children understand them, and they enjoy them very much; but words they do not understand, and they are utterly excluded from the enjoyment of public worship if they are without the knowledge of the system of signs. There is not one child in five hundred who can understand a minister who preaches. Mr. Chamberlain is one of the most accomplished readers on the lips that I know, and he testifies, that if he can get within a certain distance of some man who makes great use of his lips, he can gather the substance of his discourse; but this is very rare indeed.

This system that we use, as I have stated, is practised in all the schools of England, except the London Institution. Mr. Sanborn thinks I am wrong, but I think he is greatly mistaken. The means of instruction in all the English schools are the natural signs of the deaf and dumb, just as they are in ours, with the exception of the London school. In some of these schools they teach the classes to whom I have referred to articulate, as a medium of communication. The instruction in France, Holland, Italy and Denmark is by signs, and, as I have said, the German schools teach by these signs. I think some of the Italian schools teach a larger class articulation than we do. The fact is, that in all the schools in the world where the English language is taught, the means that is taken by intelligent men to give deaf-mutes the knowledge of language, is this language of signs.

Now, sir, to what extent do we use the language of signs? We use the language of signs to teach our language to the deaf-mute, and enlighten his mind. It is not an end, but a means. As soon as we can teach these children our language, our forms of expression, and communicate questions in that way, we use our language, just as you would in teaching French. As soon as your child is able to use a French phrase, you give him a French phrase, and as soon as you can communicate with your child in French, you do so. That is precisely what we do with the deaf and dumb. A child comes to me to get me to explain a word. I do not explain it by signs, unless it is a very hard word; I give him some other word. Our only object is to enlighten his mind, and we use the signs to teach him the language we have. We use the system of signs to that extent.

Now, sir, I wish no better argument for the excellence of the system that we have in use at Hartford, and have had for so many years, than the mute persons who are around here in Boston and in your State. They have been educated by this system; they have been taught at Hartford, as the children are taught there now; and I wish no better proof of the excellence of our system than these young men furnish.

Are they intelligent or not? Are they respected or not? Are they taking care of themselves or not? Are they able to communicate or not? Until our friends can show us a generation of articulating deaf-mute children who can communicate as easily, and can go about and do their business as well as these young men, I think in fairness they ought to allow that they are mistaken in their notions.

It has been said that there is no progress in Hartford; that we are just where we were fifty years ago; that the world moves; but the Hartford institution stays where it was, and the whole world is passing by us. Now, any person who makes such a remark is profoundly ignorant, I am sorry to say, of what we have done and what we are doing. He might just as well say, that since the Arabic characters have been used, there has been no progress in mathematics, because we use the Arabic characters now; or that there has been no progress in writing, because we began by using paper and ink and use them now. We have the same purpose in view that we had at first, fifty years ago. The desire to enlighten the mind of the deaf-mute and relieve him from misfortune. We take the same means. We take his natural language, what he does know, to teach him what he does not know. Aside from that, there is nothing there that was there fifty years ago. The processes, the modes of instruction, are entirely different. The old French system of Sicard was methodical signs. The old system of teaching when we first started was teaching endless vocabularies—hundreds and hundreds of words,—isolated words,—without giving the children any language at all. We do not do that now. We teach the different classes of words. We teach a few nouns, a few verbs, a few adverbs, a few adjectives, and put them immediately into connected language, just as other children are taught; so that in that matter we are entirely removed from the old French style. The old French system of instruction, which Sicard dwelt upon so much, was the old methodical system, a sign for each word; but that is not the way in which we now teach. You may not be aware of the fact, that the great difficulty with the deaf and dumb is, that we do not think in the order in which we talk. We think of the objects before we think of their qualities. We do not think of a *black* horse—putting the “black” first; we think of the horse, and then of the quality or color. It is so with regard to actions. We do not think of the qualifying word and then the action. Well, this language lies in the minds of the deaf and dumb just as it does in our minds; but, as a matter of education, we have come to arrange language in an artificial way. Sicard thought the best method of teaching was to give the words just as they stand in our speech. Take a phrase like this, “A strong man rows a small boat easily.” [The speaker illustrated the method of teaching this phrase by signs, which, of course,

cannot be exhibited on paper.] So you have given a sign for every word, you have told just what part of speech the word is, and just where it stands in the sentence. You have taught the child all that; he writes it down; he knows it; and you have taught him just as much and no more than if you were to add up a column of figures, and tell him the sum. It is a matter of memory only. You have not taught him how to construct any sentence. We do not teach in that way at all now. How do we teach now? We teach a sentence in the order of construction; we teach it just as anybody ought to teach it, as we hold. We give the idea in the first place. I ask a boy, "What did I tell you about? Did I speak about a horse, dog, bird, man?" He says "Man." That is the subject. "Did I qualify that at all? Did I say black man, white man, weak man, strong man?" He says, I said "strong man." I tell him we put the adjective before the noun because it does not sound well to put it after. "Did I say two men, three men, one man?" He says, "a man." "What did this man do,—run, shout, or what?" He says, "he rows." Well, that is an action. "What does he row? Does he row a ship, a wagon, or what?" "He rows a boat." That comes next. "Did I qualify that in any way? Did I say small boat, little boat, iron boat, wooden boat?" "You said, small boat." "How does he row it—easily or in what way?" "He rows it easily." Simply by calling his attention to these points, he gets real instruction. Then I give him another sentence similar to that. I do not help him about that, but he suggests these questions himself, and puts the sentence into form. Thus you see the child learns something. That is not the way they used to teach, it is a new and better method.

I have been connected with the Hartford institution about thirty-four years. I went there in 1833. In 1852, I went to Ohio, and during that interval the method of instruction in that institution had changed almost entirely. I returned in 1863, and during my absence the method of instruction had again changed almost entirely. Not these great ends that the teachers sought, but the methods by which they endeavored to reach these ends. One teacher, who had been very successful, instead of teaching these words that I speak of, puts the children, in the first place, into sentences, and makes language mean something, and then goes back on these single words.

We have seven educated gentlemen in the Hartford institution, and for a long course of years we have had a meeting every week, to discuss sharply this system of instruction, and the best way of teaching this thing and that thing; and these gentlemen have every encouragement from the Head of the institution to devise the best means of instruction. Is it probable that, under these circumstances, these men have not, during all these years, made any progress or improvement?

Whether it is progress or not, they have made great changes, and, we think, progress—improvement. In regard to that, the results show.

There is one other point. Dr. Howe made the remark, in 1843, that he thought it was very easy to teach the deaf and dumb. Mr. Gallaudet told him at that time that that statement did not accord with his experience; and, in fact, it does not accord with any man's experience who ever tried it. As a matter of theory, it may be true; as a matter of fact, it is not. It is comparatively easy to teach a few words, a few phrases; but that is a different matter from educating a deaf-mute. To give a deaf and dumb child a knowledge of language is a difficult thing. Some ladies here have tried it. I think Mrs. Hubbard will not say she has found it easy to teach her little girl. I think she mentioned to me that if her child had been born deaf, she would not have undertaken the task at all; and I think she mentioned to a friend of mine, that Mr. Hubbard himself had very little idea of the immense labor required to teach that little child. I think Miss Rogers will not say it is easy to teach these children. If she thinks so now, she will not a year hence. There is nothing mysterious about it, but it is difficult. Why? Because they have got to learn by the eye. We say it is easier for them to learn by signs which they can see, than by the motion of the lips, which they can scarcely see. I say, without fear of contradiction from any person who has ever tried to teach a deaf-mute, that it is a very difficult work. And for these reasons: He is in the dark with regard to all these things; he does not know language; he has no knowledge of the analogies of language; he knows nothing of the meaning of words; he has to learn the language entirely by his eye, without any help whatever from his ear; he must find out all these complications of language in that way. You are well aware that it is not easy to learn any language. How many persons in our schools who learn French, learn it easily and accurately, so that they can talk it and write it with facility? Take our young men who go to college, spend three years in preparation, and stay there four years; when they come out, how accurately have they got the Greek and the Latin? Can they speak them as we speak English? Can they read them as we can read English? I say it is a very difficult thing to learn a foreign language, with our ears open, and knowing one language. How much more difficult must it be to teach the deaf and dumb language! I think it is a radical error with these gentlemen, to suppose that anybody can teach the deaf and dumb. If it is so easy, why do they not educate these children? We find that they do not. They cannot do it; and it is because the deaf-mutes require special instruction. We find many deaf-mutes who are members of intelligent families. All the affections of the family yearn over these children; they would relieve them if

they could ; they cannot bear the idea of their exclusion from society. Yet we do not find, with all their intense interest, with all the yearnings of affection, that they educate these children. Sometimes a person, devoting himself or herself entirely to one child, is able to work out the education of that child to a great extent ; but is it light work ? As a matter of fact, it is a most difficult task. If it is possible, why do not maternal affection, and the affection of brothers and sisters in families, lift those deaf-mutes out of their misfortune ? They teach them a few simple phrases, but the process of education they do not find that they are able to reach at all.

We find that in order to educate the deaf and dumb, we must get teachers of experience and ability ; that a man who has not ability, a man who has not a keen mind, who does not see the analogies of language, who has not a sharp power of analysis, does not succeed. On that account we are obliged to hire men who have these qualities. We should be glad to hire cheap teachers, if they could do the work ; but we find that we must have men of education and talent, men who can get employment anywhere at remunerative rates. We find that only these men succeed, and even they do not succeed at first. That is, they are obliged to have instruction month after month. Many a teacher have I taught daily for a year in order to qualify him. We do not consider a teacher qualified, as we say, "to go alone," to go into a class and teach it in the best way, until he has had four years' experience.

It seems to me that the supposition that anybody can teach the deaf and dumb, is a fallacy on the part of our friends, and experience shows it is a very great mistake. It has been suggested that these deaf-mutes can be taught in the common schools. That is no new suggestion ; it is a thing that has been tried over and over again. The fact is, that a great many of the children we have, go to common schools for a long time before they come to us, where they have intelligent teachers ; and what do they learn ? They learn some of the common rules of arithmetic, in many instances, and in many instances they do not ; they get a fair handwriting in many instances ; they fail of that in a great many instances ; but there is no reason why they cannot. The processes of arithmetic they get, and sometimes they get a few words ; but that is not education. This matter was tried very thoroughly in Prussia ; the Prussian government was very much occupied with its warlike operations, and thought it could not afford to spend any more money than was absolutely necessary for the education of the deaf and dumb. It placed the deaf and dumb in the common schools, but found the results very unsatisfactory.

Dr. Howe remarked upon the domestic employments of the children of the institution, and said that if he had had the privilege of suggesting

changes, he would have made some improvements. I am sorry that the doctor was so entirely ignorant of the domestic arrangements of the institution. He thought our girls had nothing to do; that they lived like ladies, and were not employed in domestic work at all. That is an entire mistake. I find, upon more minute inquiry since I was here last, that our girls are divided into four classes, and those classes have different duties. I think the specific duties of the different classes are changed about once a month. The first class clear the tables, wipe the dishes, take the entire charge of their sleeping-rooms, and of the halls, which abundantly occupies them. The second class sweep and dust the school-rooms and halls. There are thirteen school-rooms, and the halls are very large. The third class have charge of the beds. Most of our children occupy single beds, and these beds are covered with white spreads, which the girls spread over them in the morning, and take them off at night. The fourth class have charge of the laundry. They put up the things as they come from the laundry, and iron their own fine things—muslins and articles of that kind. All who are not employed in this way are engaged every morning in making garments, mending, knitting, and in plain sewing. At four o'clock in the afternoon, all the girls are employed in plain sewing about one hour and a half. They cut and make all their own dresses and under garments, do all their own mending, make all the sheets, table-cloths, towels and napkins, make all the boys' shirts, and knit all the boys' socks. These duties abundantly occupy these little folks. The boys who are over twelve years of age go into the shops. We consider it a very important matter to teach them, while with us, a trade. I think Dr. Howe's views on this point are entirely mistaken. These children, without any interference with their education, get a good trade by working during the intervals of school. They are with masters whom they can understand, and they learn to do these different things. They get a very good knowledge of their trades, so that they can take care of themselves when they leave the institution. It is very well known that an intelligent mechanic will not take a deaf-mute to teach him a trade; he cannot take the trouble. He says, "He is a dummy," and he will not take him as an apprentice. But if he has learned a trade, he feels kindly towards him, and will take him, and be glad to take him. There are hundreds of deaf-mutes in your city, who are supporting themselves and their families, and, in many instances, their friends, by means of the trades which they learned at Hartford. If we did as they do in English and German schools—take a child when he is too young to go into a shop, give him his education, and have him get his trade afterwards—we should find the same difficulty that they do there. They are obliged to pay master mechanics, after the children leave the

schools, to teach them their trades. We not only save this expense, but we teach these children their trades in a language which they know, and they find no difficulty in going into shops to work. If you ask the master mechanics in Worcester if they find any trouble in communicating with these young men, they will tell you, No. It is so in Chickering's piano factory, in this city. There are four deaf-mutes there, who have been there for years, and who get a very handsome living; and you will find, if you make the inquiry, that they are considered valuable men, and that there is no difficulty in communicating with them. They work by the job, do their work satisfactorily, and there is no trouble because they are deaf and dumb. But if Mr. Chickering were asked to teach a child who had had no instruction in his trade, he would not have anything to do with him; he could not afford to spend the time; nobody could. But these young men have their trades; they are ready to go to work; all you have to do is to put tools into their hands, and they earn their wages, and give satisfaction. This is a great point in their education, we think; and, as a matter of fact, they get trades while with us that enable them to take care of themselves and do well. The deaf-mutes of your State, and of the New England States, by the trades they learned while with us, are succeeding well. Very few of these young men in Boston need charity; they are getting good wages, and supporting themselves, and many can help others.

Allusion was made to the fact that this institution was located at Hartford, and it was said that it was so far off that it was difficult to supervise it. The Directors and those interested in the institution are very happy to see the Massachusetts gentlemen, and they have had the pleasure of receiving visits from them very often. You know the Governor and Council make us a visit every year. We cannot agree with Dr. Howe that these men are dolts, that they have not their eyes open. We supposed that they were as intelligent men as you had in your State. They have had every opportunity to see these children, and to learn how they are cared for—the food they eat, the beds they sleep on, and the instruction they receive. I am sure, that if my child was in the school, and I had such opportunities of ascertaining all the facts in regard to him, I could tell whether he was well taken care of or not. We have had five different visits from the Secretary of the Board of State Charities, and we are always very happy to see him. We should be glad to see the members of the Board of State Charities every day in the week, if they chose to come. They come at all times in the week, and all hours of the day, and we think they have abundant means of finding out how the institution is conducted.

The distance was spoken of as a serious matter; but it was arranged by commissioners appointed by your Legislature to send your

deaf-mutes to Hartford at a time when they went by stages, and Hartford was twenty hours from Boston; now, the distance is nothing at all. The fact is, that Hartford is as central for Massachusetts as any town you could name, and far more central than Boston. The distance does not amount to anything, in our judgment. I cannot understand how it is so easy for all the blind children of New England to come to Boston, as Dr. Howe thinks they can, with perfect facility, and yet the deaf-mutes of Massachusetts cannot go to Hartford! A few years ago, they thought of establishing an institution for the blind in Maine, but Dr. Howe thought one institution was enough for the country; that the blind had no trouble in coming here from Maine; and he thinks they have no trouble in coming here from all New England. And there is no trouble in deaf-mutes going to Hartford—none at all.

I wish to state distinctly, in closing, why we desire the deaf-mutes of Massachusetts to come to Hartford. We wish not to be misunderstood on this point at all. We have there abundant accommodations; we have experienced teachers; we have large investments in real estate, in buildings, in apparatus, in pictures, in shops, in tools—entirely sufficient for the education of the deaf-mutes of New England. We are certain that there is no institution with more able men than we have; we are certain we give the deaf-mutes who come to us a good education; that is not denied on any hand; it is undeniable and undenied; we can educate about the number of deaf-mutes that New England furnishes more efficiently than a smaller number; we have this corps of teachers, and there is emulation, there is the spur which one teacher gives another, and there is mutual effort. We also like—I am free to say it—this prestige of numbers. We have one of the largest institutions in the country, we think it is one of the most successful, and we should like to continue to be one of the largest institutions. Then the point of classification, to which I referred the other day, is a very serious matter—and the only serious matter about it. About the present number of new pupils every year enables us to classify these children in the best way. But, gentlemen, we do not suppose that in sending your children to Hartford, you are patronizing us at all. We do not want your *patronage*; we do not want the patronage of any one. This institution was established not for the benefit of any State; it was established as much by Massachusetts men as by Connecticut men. Out of the twelve first Vice-Presidents, five were from Boston; out of the thirty-nine Life Directors, fourteen were from Massachusetts. The institution was established by benevolent men for the education of the deaf-mutes of New England—of the country, at first; and it has ever been managed with that design. Out of the thirteen teachers we have at Hartford, seven are Massachusetts men; out of the three matrons, two are from Massa-

chusetts ; of the two stewards, one is a Massachusetts man ; and one of the two masters of our shops is a Massachusetts man. It is not in any sense a Connecticut institution, any more than it is a Massachusetts institution, or than it is an institution of any other of the New England States. It happens, by the merest accident, to be the other side of the State line. The simple accident, that the little girl who excited such an interest in deaf-mute education happened to be in Hartford, caused the institution to be established there. The State of Connecticut has no more to do with it than Massachusetts. It is a New England institution ; not a Connecticut institution. But we want you to understand that it is not to get your patronage that we are here from day to day ; we simply want you to understand the relation there is between us. In our judgment, it is just as much your institution as ours. If you do not choose to send your children there, we have nothing to say. The Directors will find a way of using that fund for the benefit of the deaf and dumb, if you think your children should not have the benefit of it. We think it is not well to deny the deaf and dumb children of Massachusetts the benefit of that institution. We think our brethren have not shown any reasons for their removal. But if you, gentlemen, and if the members of the Legislature and the citizens of Massachusetts, after looking at this matter, prefer that your children should not come to Hartford, we have not the least objection ; we shall have no hard feelings at all. But, as I said, it is not your patronage that we seek. We do not come here to get your patronage, but simply to show that this is just as much an institution of Massachusetts as it is of Connecticut. I think no fact is plainer than this : that if this institution happened to be twenty miles this way, we should hear nothing about the removal of these children. Even if Dr. Howe and the Secretary of the Board of State Charities did not have the direction of the institution, we should not hear a word of this project to remove them. Suppose it was twenty miles further north, under the same control that it is now, with precisely the same system of instruction, I have no idea that this matter would be agitated at all. I have no idea that, if you have an institution in your State, you will teach under any different system. Massachusetts men are sensible men ; they understand what is right and what is wrong.

The gentlemen, who have brought up these objections to the institution, have stated them courteously ; I have tried to answer them with equal courtesy. They are not new objections. Dr. Howe has had the same objections for thirty years. The views of these gentlemen are right in the teeth of the experience of all practical teachers. Every experiment that has been suggested has been tried and failed ; and these are only the old questions over again.

Our only object in appearing before you is to show you what our institution has done, and the grounds upon which we stand. We do not propose to be misunderstood in this matter. We do not propose to have it said that we are on the wrong course, or that we are not well organized. If we are rightly understood on these points, and if you understand the relation you sustain to us, that is all we desire.

MR. SANBORN. I would like to inquire with regard to these pupils who profit by articulation, the number of which Mr. Stone states to be eleven.

MR. STONE. I do not state the number distinctly. I say, about that.

MR. SANBORN. Not more than twelve?

MR. STONE. I do not say that.

MR. SANBORN. The exact statement, I believe, was, that there are about one in twenty. The number in the institution is, I think, about two hundred and twenty, which of course makes the number of these pupils about eleven. There may be twelve, and there may be thirteen. I would like to inquire whether any instruction in articulation is given to any except this number—from eleven to twelve?

MR. STONE. No direct instruction in articulation.

MR. SANBORN. I would like to inquire how many hours a day are devoted to the instruction of this small number?

MR. STONE. Our instruction of this number is in this way. They are put in classes, with teachers who can hear and speak. They are constantly communicated with orally by their instructors, and they recite orally. We consider this mode very much more efficient than giving them instruction for any time. Dr. Howe, I believe, mentioned that he considered it more satisfactory. We throw them upon their articulation, and in that way retain and improve it.

MR. SANBORN. Would the extent of time which they are occupied in learning articulation amount to two hours a day?

MR. STONE. It depends upon how much they talk.

MR. SANBORN. I can easily imagine that. But would the time, on the average, amount to that?

MR. STONE. I cannot judge at all. Sometimes they talk less, sometimes more. Sometimes their lessons are longer, and sometimes shorter.

MR. SANBORN. The reason I ask these questions is, that Mr. Gallaudet, the President of the Deaf-Mute College at Washington, in his recent report which he has sent me, cites the case of a pupil who was at Hartford three years, who was questioned on this point. He was born with hearing, and retained the power of articulation when he went to Hartford. He was questioned as to how much instruction he received at Hartford in articulation, and replied, from fifteen minutes to half an hour for the first year.

Mr. STONE. That was before I was there. He was not my pupil

Mr. TURNER. I think I can answer that question. He was there under my instruction. I had, during the ten years I was Principal of the institution, a teacher of articulation, employed expressly for that purpose, and whose whole time was devoted to that one object. She took them in classes, and spent from twenty minutes to half an hour with each of these classes daily. This was a direct, persistent and long-continued effort with the semi-mutes to teach them articulation; and what that young man refers to was this regular instruction which he had from this articulating teacher. In addition to that, he had the same exercise that Mr. Stone refers to in his class, where he was taught by a hearing person, which was continued more or less through the whole day. Whenever the time came for the teacher to hear his recitation, it was made orally; if there was any mistake on his slate, it was orally pointed out; and whenever a child was required to change an expression, oral communication was had with the pupil. So that systematic instruction in articulation was from twenty minutes to half an hour a day, while the articulation between teacher and pupil, in the process of education, was continued more or less throughout the day.

Mr. SANBORN. I suppose we are to understand that the amount of instruction has increased since that time?

Mr. STONE. It may have or may not. We do not give the specific instruction now. We consider it very much more efficient to throw them on their articulation in their daily intercourse with the teacher and the family.

Mr. SANBORN. Then I would like to inquire if these articulating pupils are ever instructed by signs from the teacher, or ever use signs in reciting to him?

Mr. STONE. They are in the habit of using articulation.

Mr. SANBORN. Do they never use any signs?

Mr. STONE. It is the natural language of some of them; they may sometimes use them; but the common language is articulation. One of these boys comes to me for something. "What do you want?" He is very apt to make signs. "I don't understand your signs; you must speak to me;" and he speaks to me. In this way, we use articulation. It would be very unnatural if these boys, having the natural language of signs, should never use it. They do use it among their mates.

Mr. SANBORN. There is a pupil at Hartford by the name of Hill, from Athol, who lost his hearing when twelve years of age, who articulates considerably better than the little girl who came here the other day. I would like to ask Mr. Stone, if he considers signs the natural language of young Hill, and whether he employs signs more than articulation in his intercourse with his teacher.

Mr. STONE. This case of young Hill is a very interesting one. He lost his hearing when twelve years old. He is not deaf and dumb. He can talk as well as any one. There is no process necessary, and none used whatever to learn the boy to talk ; it would be perfectly ridiculous. He can talk as well as any of us, and is an intelligent boy. There is this simple fact in regard to young Hill, as well as in regard to others who are brought to us who can talk perfectly well. They do not belong to us, but they are brought to the institution because they get a better education there than they can anywhere else. Young Hill cannot hear at all, but there are some children brought to Hartford who have been rejected at the common school because of some thickness of hearing. They are neglected, and, perhaps, ill-treated. In one case, a boy was brought to the institution who had been twice punished for disobeying rules which his mother thought he could not hear ; but I talked with him as I would with you. These children are sent to us because it is thought they get a better education with us than in the common schools. The institution is not designed for these pupils, but we do not object to taking them, as we have room enough. We talk with them as we talk with other persons, and keep up their articulation. We think it is something in favor of our institution that persons are sent to us who talk perfectly well, and might be taught in the common schools, because they advance with us faster than in the common school, and get more attention. In fact, I may mention that we are told, and we suppose it is so, that our deaf-mute children make more rapid progress than their brothers and sisters in the common schools of New England. We know that the letters which they write, compared with those they receive, are far in favor of the deaf-mute children. Of course there are exceptions ; I am speaking of the general rule.

Mr. SANBORN. The Committee will excuse me for having insisted a little on this question. I did so because this statement does not agree precisely with the statement of Mr. Storrs, the teacher of the boy to whom I have referred. On my last visit to the Asylum, I spent perhaps an hour with the class of Mr. Storrs, when this boy Hill, and perhaps four or five other articulating pupils were present ; and after talking with Hill and with the others, with one exception, as I stated at the previous hearing, I asked Mr. Storrs—who is a very accomplished teacher of this class of pupils—what special instruction he gave in articulation. He said, if I understood him correctly, and I think I did, that in the ordinary exercises of the class together, (here was a class of nine,) it was impossible to make use of articulation. Therefore, when he gave instruction in Latin grammar, for instance, (as I heard him do,) to the whole class, he used the language of signs. The language of signs was received and responded to by Hill and several young ladies,

the other articulating pupils, just as if they had been born deaf. Mr. Storrs said that he did occasionally give instruction singly to the members of this class in regard to their lessons, using the method of articulation; but the impression left on my mind was that the principal instruction communicated by him in even such an extraordinary case as that of Hill, was through the language of signs; and I am quite sure that the language of signs is that which these pupils use with each other, because I saw them constantly employing it, although I knew them to be capable of articulating, and some of them of hearing partially. There is a girl in that class who can hear to a certain extent. She can hear so well that she understood some remarks that were made, although not addressed directly to her; and she can read the lips so well that, when sitting some twelve or fifteen feet from me, she understood what I said to a boy I was talking to close by me, while the boy did not. She understood me, and made some reply. All these children, according to Mr. Storrs, receive the greater part of their instruction through the sign language, which, I maintain, is no more natural to them than it is to me.

MR. STONE. I think Mr. Sanborn possibly does not understand me, but it is scarcely worth while to reply. Of course we do not change the plan of instruction for these special cases. The direct intercourse of the teacher with this pupil is oral, but he gives instruction to the class in signs, and it is no detriment to the boy to understand signs. He can speak as well as you or I can.

MR. BRANNING. I would inquire whether hearing children are put under deaf-mute teachers?

MR. STONE. We are very particular to put hearing children under hearing and speaking teachers, for this very purpose.

MR. SANBORN. How many deaf-mute teachers are there?

MR. STONE. Two gentlemen and three ladies—out of our thirteen, we have five deaf-mute teachers.

MR. SANBORN. I understand that none of those who are able to articulate are taught by deaf-mute teachers?

MR. STONE. As far as I recollect, they are not. Our general plan is to put those children who can hear—the semi-mutes—with hearing and speaking teachers.

MR. SANBORN. I would like to ask Mr. Stone if he considers that our visits, or those of the Council, or of the Legislative Committees of the State have been sufficiently long to enable us really to make an examination of the attainments of the children? Whether he thinks that the time we have spent there has been enough to enable us to really know whether the children were advancing or retrograding?

Mr. STONE. I think that intelligent men, visiting an institution of that sort five times, ought to be able to find out whether the children are progressing or not. I think if I visited a school five times, and had every opportunity of seeing the process of instruction, I could make up my mind whether the children were properly instructed or not. Certainly we desire that our friends should satisfy their minds on these points, and give them every possible facility.

Mr. SANBORN. Then, if we have had these opportunities, and have come to the very decided conclusion that the teaching of articulation is not carried at Hartford to anything like the extent to which it is carried in some schools, to our knowledge, I would like to inquire if Mr. Stone would attach any weight to that opinion?

Mr. STONE. I think I have already sufficiently explained my views with regard to articulation. Whether Mr. Sanborn agrees with them or not I cannot say, and it is a matter with us of no great consequence. We have formed our opinions with regard to our system of instruction very carefully; and we are very anxious to get all the light on the subject we can. Mr. Sanborn, I am sorry to say, has not given us any new light. We should be glad to get new light from any quarter. We endeavor to retain and improve the articulation of those who have the power to articulate; we make no effort to give it to those who have it not.

Mr. SANBORN. I would say, in regard to the matter of articulation, that I think some confusion is created, perhaps by what has been said on both sides, certainly by what I have heard to-day. Two or three classes of persons are grouped together. The advocates of the removal of the Massachusetts children from Hartford, and of teaching them in Massachusetts, do not advocate—and they have taken pains to say so expressly several times—the teaching of articulation to all deaf-mutes. There are persons in the world who advocate that; we do not, and we want that to be distinctly understood. Therefore, any criticisms based upon the teaching of a considerable number of deaf-mutes, who, we believe, cannot profitably be taught to articulate, have no weight, with regard to our arguments. But there is a class of deaf-mutes which, we believe, could profitably be taught to articulate; and this class consists mainly of persons not born deaf, the number of whom in the Hartford institution is more than half the pupils now there, judging by the cases of one hundred and nineteen examined by our board in November. It consists in a small part of children who were born deaf. I have myself seen cases of articulation in children who were born deaf, and who seemed quite as easy to be taught as those who were born with hearing. We maintain, therefore, that the teaching of articulation should be applied to those children who are capable of learning it, and

we maintain that the class is very much larger than is stated by Mr. Stone. That is the reason of my sticking so closely to this point.

MR. STONE. I think Mr. Sanborn's estimate of the number of semi-mutes is not that which we find. In a report made about ten years ago, in the summing up of the whole number of pupils who had, up to that time, been educated at the institution, it is stated that the whole number of congenital deaf-mutes, as nearly as could be ascertained, was 542; those who had their hearing once and lost it, 483; not ascertained, 51; not deaf, 5.

MR. TURNER then addressed the Committee. He said:

I feel no little embarrassment, gentlemen, in commencing an address to you on this subject, from the fact that the ground has been so thoroughly gone over by the gentleman who has preceded me. He has touched upon nearly every important point in the course of instruction in our processes, and on all the matters of dispute (in so far as there are any such matters), between the advocates of the system adopted in Hartford and the German system, or the system of articulation. I cannot, therefore, go on with a connected discussion of this whole subject, without going over ground that has been gone over so thoroughly and so well by the gentleman who has preceded me; and I can therefore do little more than occupy the time with a summing up of the matters in discussion which have not been so particularly dwelt upon—alluding to topics, rather than giving a thorough discussion of the whole subject.

Whatever may be the difference of views among those who advocate these different modes of instruction, we all admit that deafness and dumbness are very great calamities. For a child to come into the world deprived of the power of hearing, unable to listen to the tones of a mother's kindness and affection, to the encouraging voice of a father's approbation, unable to engage in the shouts of pleasure that issue from brothers and sisters and playmates, to be shut out from the universal music and voice of nature, to be deaf to the charms of harmony and melody, and to be deprived of all the ordinary modes of social intercourse, of the means of intelligence in regard to passing events, and of everything of interest to a cultivated mind, is indeed a great calamity. This is the calamity which has come upon the deaf and dumb child. And, gentlemen, this calamity can never be removed. That child will always remain a deaf, unhearing child, youth, man, until the time of his death. The efforts that have been made in this direction, and have been judiciously conducted by most intelligent, benevolent and philosophical physicians, have resulted in the universal conviction, that congenital deafness, that deafness which comes upon infancy through scarlet

fever, measles, and various other acute diseases, can never be cured. The French physician, Dr. Itard, who perhaps devoted more time, systematically, to the alleviation of the deaf and dumb in this particular than any other man ever did, after years of research, investigation and experiment, came to the conclusion, that the child born deaf, or who lost its hearing in the way I have indicated, in early infancy, is hopelessly deaf; that this calamity cannot be cured. And such has been the result of all the experience we have had in this country. There have been quacks, there have been charlatans, who have gone about the country professing to cure deafness, and restore the deaf and dumb to hearing and speech. Quite a number of the pupils who have come under my instruction had been subjected to their experiments, but in no single instance had a cure been effected. Dr. Tognio, Dr. Turnbull, and various other doctors of this description, in England and in this country, have made these experiments, but in no single instance have they ever effected a cure that has come under my notice, or that of any of my teachers, or of Dr. Peet, with whom I have often conversed upon the subject. They have never been successful in restoring a single person to hearing, and consequently to speech.

But, gentlemen, this calamity may be alleviated; and that is all that the teachers of the deaf and dumb pretend to accomplish, and all that their best friends can expect. We can never make hearing and speaking persons of these deaf-mutes. We can give them a measure of vocalization, imperfect, to be sure; we can teach some of them to pronounce, parrot-like, words something in the way we do; but we cannot make them understand the use of vocal language, with its articulation, its emphasis, its point. It never has been done, it never can be done. I want here, gentlemen, to discriminate sharply between semi-mutes and semi-hearing children, and those who are born deaf, or who lost their hearing during the early months of infancy. We do not claim at Hartford, we do not claim in any of our institutions, that there is not a class of semi-mutes in our country who can be taught by articulation; and we do not claim this, because they had speech before they became deaf; they could speak as well as any child at the age of five, six, seven, eight or nine years, when they lost their hearing; they had acquired the ability to read to some extent, as in the case of the young man whom I exhibited to you when I was here before, Mr. Chamberlain; they were able to converse with their parents and brothers and sisters and all about them intelligently, on most subjects, before this calamity of deafness came upon them; and after it came, they retained the ability to speak and continued to use it up to the time that they came to the institution, have continued to use it up to this time, and will continue to use it as long as they live. I wish to confine my atten-

tion to the legitimately deaf and dumb—those born so, and those who lost their hearing any time before they learnt to speak. And we find no difference with regard to this class of persons. We find no difference in the capacity of those children to speak who lost their hearing in infancy, although they perhaps had learnt to say “papa” and “mamma,” and some other simple words, and those who were born deaf; they are alike absolutely dumb.

Now, what are the two theories? They have already been described, but I will just allude to them once more. The theory of the German schools is, that we are to take deaf and dumb children, absolutely deaf, absolutely dumb, (for I am not now talking about the semi-mutes or about those who can hear some,) and teach them to articulate. I will not venture to say exactly what proportion of the deaf and dumb are in that condition, but I should say that from three-fourths to five-sixths of all who came to the institution during the forty-two years I was connected with it, came there entirely deaf and dumb. This is not a mere matter of guess work, for I have sometimes made the estimate. What can be done with these children? How can we alleviate this misfortune, and what do we aim to do? The object is the same, both with the German and the French teachers. It is to educate them. In other words, to give them a knowledge of written language, so that they shall be able to read this language when it is presented to their eyes on the printed page or on the manuscript sheet—that they shall be able to read and comprehend its meaning. When the child, for instance, receives from the teacher the command, “Go and shut that door,” he reads it, and performs the act. We have every evidence then that he understands it. “Bring me the book lying on that table;” he goes and gets the book and brings it to me. I know, then, that that child is in communication with me, and that I am in communication with him by this written language. That is the object we have in view in the education of the deaf and dumb. It is to bring the deaf and dumb child into communication with the world around him by means of written or printed language, addressed to the eye; and when that is accomplished, the end for which we labor is accomplished.

There are two theories in regard to the way in which this grand effect shall be produced. The German teachers, as I have said, have a theory that these deaf and dumb children, these mutes, (I speak now of the legitimately deaf and dumb,) can be taught to articulate, and in that way make known their own feelings and wants to the world around them; that they can be taught to read on the lips of those who address them such communications as they choose to make, and can comprehend, from the motions of the lips, what is said to them. In other words, that they can be brought into communication with the world around

them by means of oral utterance, or rather what I should call oral signs. The French method aims to accomplish the same end, that of bringing the child into communication with the world around him, by means of written language; and it is done by signs and by the manual alphabet. These are the two systems used to produce the same end. Now, if the German method could be successful, if we could teach all these deaf-mutes to articulate so well that they could be understood, if we could teach them all to read the motions of the lips in the utterances of hearing persons, so that they could understand all that was said to them, certainly we concede the fact that that would be altogether the best mode of instruction, because it would be so much easier for others to communicate with them and for them to communicate with others. That is the point upon which the Germans ground their whole theory. That it is so much better, so much easier, so much more natural, to communicate with others by the spoken language than it is either by the finger language or by writing; and their claim is, (without anything being said as to its feasibility,) that this is the best and most appropriate means of communicating instruction to the deaf and dumb.

Now, what is the French process, and what is the process of those who teach the deaf and dumb in our country? We take the child with a language—as has already been explained by Mr. Stone—the language of signs. How does this child come by this language of signs? He originates it, and his friends around him help him; together, they originate this language. It is not innate, it is not a gift of God; it is an acquirement; it is an invention—an invention of the child and of the friends around him. This little mute sees that the parents communicate with other children by certain motions of the mouth. He hears no sound, and does not comprehend it. He has his wants and feelings, and desires to express them, but he cannot do it in that way. If he makes his mouth go ever so much, it carries no intelligence to the minds of those about him. What then does he do? He does the only thing in his power, he manifests his feelings by the expression of his countenance. He expresses his pleasure when certain things are done; he expresses his displeasure and disapprobation when other things are done. He looks with a longing look towards certain things that he wants, and expresses aversion to certain other things; and in that way he finds that his friends begin to understand him. Then he ventures further; he begins to make outward expressions, not simply those of the countenance, but of the hands; and to imitate motions. He wants drink, and he looks round for it; he wants something to eat, and he looks for that, or perhaps points to where it is kept; and he finds his mother understands him, and gives him what he wants. This success encourages him to go on, and he goes on step by step until there is

established between him and those around him a natural, and yet to a certain extent conventional language, adequate to his wants, adequate to the expression of his simple ideas and feelings. If he is sick, he makes it known to his mother by the expression of distress on his countenance, and she is ready to inquire, "Where, where?" He points to his head, or his stomach. These things are well understood, and in this way there grows up a means of communication between this child and his mother and those about him, which for his purpose is sufficiently expressive, sufficiently extensive; and with that language of signs, by which he communicates with those immediately conversant with him about the operations of the farm, or the house, or the places about him, he can communicate very well. He comes to an institution where he finds, for the first time in his life, that there is a society that he can understand. He has enjoyed nothing like social intercourse; he has never met a community with which he could converse freely. Everywhere he goes, this motion of the lips which brings no intelligence, communicates no information to him, prevails; and now he finds himself in a community where the sign-language is used; they all understand it, they are all ready to catch it, and all comprehend its meaning. He looks on with perfect astonishment and perfect delight; and in a little while, mixing with this community of sign-speakers, he becomes an adept, and can talk signs as well as any of them. Therefore, there is no necessity for a teacher to waste any time in teaching these children the deaf and dumb signs. They get the signs from one another faster than we want to use them in the school-room; and our whole object, therefore, is to take this language, which is intelligible to the pupil, and make it an instrument with which to teach a written language—our language; a language which he does not understand, by a language which he does. And he acquires this language faster than he wants to use it, so that long before the time that we can communicate with him by written words, we can inquire of him about his family, his father and mother, brothers and sisters, where he has been in early life, and so forth. We can carry on colloquial intercourse with these pupils in a very short time, to almost any extent.

Now, is there no benefit in this language of signs, in explaining things which are unknown? It is a theory of education, I believe, that only one difficulty at a time should be brought to the knowledge of a child. We therefore adopt the language of signs, because it is a surer and easier method, a more natural, a more philosophical method, than it is to attempt to teach him by oral utterances which he does not understand and cannot comprehend, and which to his mind convey no meaning or information whatever. And here I wish to make a distinction. What are the oral sounds? They are signs just as clearly as any other.

Suppose you say to a deaf and dumb child the word "Drink." This utterance, the motion of the lips, carries no idea to his mind. It does not fall in with his previous knowledge or his previous convictions. There is nothing in the mind of the child corresponding to this motion of the lips. But if you make the expressive sign of drinking, and say to him "Drink," that is a sign he knows. Then write the word "Drink," tell him that is the very same thing, and that goes to his intelligence. He says, "Oh, yes—drink; I know that." You substitute a known sign for the word. In other words, you explain the written word, "Drink," by a well-known sign. The moment the child sees the word, he makes the sign for it; he understands that the word represents the idea of drink; and whenever he sees that word, he immediately says, "I know that." You see the difference, gentlemen, between teaching a deaf and dumb child by means of a language which he knows, and attempting to teach him by means of a language which he does not know; and that is a great advantage. That is the philosophical basis of this language of signs, and that is the advantage, as we claim, which it has over any other method. We use sign words simply to interpret, or as substitutes for, the written words. The sign words the child knows at once; the written words he associates with them, and thereby gains a knowledge of their meaning. The articulated word he knows nothing about. When you make the sign with the mouth, it conveys no idea; when you make the sign of expression, or gesture, or pantomime, it conveys an idea. In the one case, you simply teach him to watch the lips and make the motion of the mouth. He copies the motion of the mouth as well as he can, but when he has learnt the motion of the mouth for "drink," it amounts to nothing; and how can the teacher make him understand that that means drink, unless he takes a tumbler and drinks from it? He must do it. The teachers in this country all do it; the Germans do it. Every gentleman who has been to Germany to learn about this matter of articulation, testifies that signs are made in all the school-rooms to explain the meaning of words. (I wish you constantly to remember that I am talking about those born deaf and dumb, who have known nothing of speech. I do not include those who have lost their hearing at five or six years of age; that is a very different subject.)

Having thus established a communication between the children and the teacher, we go on to instruct the pupils in regard to the unknown word by means of the known sign as the instrument, until we unfold to them the whole mystery of language. Mr. Stone has gone through with that subject, and I will not pursue it any further, except to say, that when the deaf-mute gets language enough so as to understand those about him, so as to read the items of intelligence in the newspaper, so as to read the simple Gospels like the writings of St. John, he can go on

from that point and improve himself greatly. You heard the testimony of Mr. Carlin, from New York. He says he is now vastly better educated than when he left the school. We admit that, gentlemen. That is one of the beauties of our system. We bring these deaf-mutes into a condition where they can go on and educate themselves. These young men who are here in Boston, graduates of our institution, know a great deal more than they did when they left Hartford. If it were not so, we should say our system was a very defective one. We carry them forward to a point where they can take hold of this work themselves, and by the help of books, and intercourse with intelligent minds, and by availing themselves of the various opportunities for acquiring knowledge which are to be found in our country, carry on their education until they become intelligent and able to write our language with as much correctness as any other men. Some of our pupils have learned another language after they have left the institution. There was a young man of this city—one of the earliest pupils in the institution under Mr. Gallaudet, and one of the most intelligent young men that we have ever educated—who acquired a good knowledge of English while he was with us, and after he left, turned his attention to French. He learned to read and write French so well, that Mr. Clerc, who was educated first in the French language, said that young Loring could read and write the French language correctly. Let it not, therefore, be considered that our institution is not what it ought to be because the young men learn a great deal after they leave us. We should be very sorry indeed if it were not so. Do our young men in college learn all that is to be learned before they leave college, and do they make no progress afterwards? Is that the common way? Do the children in our common schools finish their education at the school, and after that learn nothing more? We admit that some of our pupils do not reach that point. Some of the States send their pupils to us for only five years, (your State allows them more time than that,) and they are to get the whole amount of primary education in that time. They come to the institution from an ignorant family, perhaps, in which there has been no attention paid to the mental cultivation, in any way, of the deaf and dumb child; for the deaf and dumb can be mentally as well as morally taught at home—(I refer more particularly to the habits taught by parents and friends before the children come to the institution.) A child comes to us, I say, from an ignorant family, from a family no one of whom, perhaps, can read and write; from a family where the influences are bad. He comes to our institution entirely ignorant, I say, sometimes almost brutish. He hardly knows that he has a head upon his shoulders. He seems to be besotted and his mind almost crushed by the surrounding stupid body. Now, it is

expected that we should take that child, begin with the A, B, C, and give him such a knowledge of our language that he can in five years' time leave the institution, read and understand what he reads, and perfect his own education. It cannot be done; it never has been done; it never will be done, by articulation, by signs, or by electricity, if it were possible to teach children electrically. It is among the impossible things, which never can be done. But if you would give us more time, if you would allow that child to come to our institution and be under our instruction as long as you insist that hearing and speaking children, who begin when they are four years old, shall remain in the common schools of your State, that is, twelve years, we could make that same stupid boy so comprehend the language that it should become an instrument of education in his case, and so that when he leaves us he can read and understand and progress, and become an intelligent, perhaps a literary man.

One point has been alluded to here to-day, to which I want to call your attention once more; and that is, the fact that in all the experience that we have had at the institution, no parent has ever brought a deaf-mute child to the institution—one born deaf, or who had lost its hearing in infancy—with a vocal language. Never has a parent established communication with such a child, even in the slightest degree, orally. No perseverance of the mother—and we know how anxious mothers are that the little one shall speak—no repetition of “mamma,” “papa,” “good boy,” “nice boy,” has been able to make the deaf and dumb child produce any vocal utterance in imitation of what the mother has said, so as to establish a system of communication between them, and enable the mother to make her wishes known to the child and to ascertain the wants of the child. It never has been done. No teacher in this country nor any other can cite an instance like that; but in nearly all cases, (I will not say in every case,) this other language of which I have been speaking, the language of signs, has been used as the medium of communication between the parents, and the brothers and sisters, and the deaf-mute child.

Without going further into the processes of our instruction, I want to take up one subject which has not been distinctly alluded to to-day, but on which a good deal of stress has been placed by some of the gentlemen who recommend the removal of the pupils of this State from the asylum at Hartford. Their objection lies against special institutions. Their objection lies against bringing deaf-mutes together in considerable numbers away from their homes, and placing them in a common building, under the care of a common matron and steward, teachers and principal, and there instructing them together. It has been said that this intensifies their calamity; that this makes them more

unlike other children than they were before; that it unfits them to associate with other people, and to engage in the ordinary business and intercourse of outside life. Now, I take the broad ground, that all that is said on this subject in regard to the deaf and dumb is very far from the facts of the case. The facts do not warrant the reception of any idea of the kind as true. However it may be with the blind, however it may be with any other class of persons, I take this broad ground and am prepared to maintain it, that it is not true with regard to the deaf and dumb. You can readily see, gentlemen, that if a boy is placed in a community of vicious boys, where all the communications are those of a corrupt and depraved nature, where all the practices are vicious and vile, this boy, brought into such a community, will become corrupted; his morals will be vitiated, his habits will become evil, and he will probably become a useless and depraved member of society. We understand that; it is the influence of evil example. But we hold that it is not so with regard to children afflicted with a calamity like that of deafness and dumbness. The mere fact that a deaf and dumb child is brought into a community where there are other deaf and dumb children, will not make him any more deaf than he was before, for he was then as utterly deaf as he could be. It will not make him any more dumb than he was before, for he was absolutely dumb before he came there. How, then, can that intensify his calamity? There is some mystery about this expression; I cannot comprehend what is intended by it. How can it intensify the calamity? The calamity is utter deafness, and the child is no worse for being associated with other deaf children. The calamity is utter dumbness, and he is no worse for being associated with dumb children. How, then, comes it that this calamity is intensified? On the other hand, I will say, that the bringing of these pupils together is an advantage to them, and alleviates their misfortune, for two reasons; the one is, that we cannot teach them at their homes. Now, I am a native of Massachusetts. I was born and lived, until I went to college, in one of the most beautiful and one of the largest towns in Berkshire County, and I have been forty-two years in the American Asylum at Hartford. During the forty-two years I was there, only two children from my native town were sent to that institution to be educated, and, so far as I know, they are the only deaf and dumb children who, in these forty-two years, have lived in that town. I believe that all the children in Great Barrington, who have been proper subjects of education at a deaf and dumb institution, have been educated at Hartford—two children in forty-two years! Now, I ask you, shall a teacher be sent into that town to educate two children, in forty-two years, at their fathers' houses? Or shall a school be estab-

lished to educate those two children (if they happen to be contemporary, which they were not,) on the ground, in order that they may live at home? Or shall we adopt Blanchet's system, and say that the teachers of the common schools shall understand this method, and that these two children shall be taught in the common school? Shall there be a normal central school, where instruction shall be given to the school-masters and school-mistresses in the processes adapted to the education of the deaf and dumb? Would it be wise to send all the teachers in that town of Great Barrington, for the space of forty-two years, to this normal central school, where they can get some light on the subject of teaching deaf-mutes, in order that they may benefit, during that period, two children and no more? You know how it is with these district school-mistresses. They do not stay in one school but one summer, and then they get married, or they find another district that will pay them higher wages, and they go there. You see what a labor it would be, to send all the teachers of the common schools, amounting to some thousands, to one central school, that they might get some knowledge of the method of instruction they must adopt provided they have a deaf and dumb child in their schools, with the probability that once in forty years there will be in one district of a town a deaf and dumb child. This idea is preposterous, and needs only to be stated to have it appear to everybody that it is entirely out of the question. We will suppose that a deaf and dumb child goes into a common school, and that the teacher has some little knowledge of the method of instruction. She has not learned the alphabet, for that is inhibited, and all signs are inhibited, but she has learned to open the mouth wide and to enunciate words distinctly. She goes into that school and there is the little deaf and dumb child. There are forty others, some just beginning to spell, some just beginning to read, and so on. How much time can she spend with this deaf and dumb child? While she is teaching him, the whole school is agog and staring to see what is done. She says "Boy," and he tries to imitate it. The whole school is in a frolic. They think that is great sport, and would like to have it going on all the time. What will be learned by that little fellow? He has five minutes devoted to him in the forenoon and five minutes in the afternoon; the rest of the time he sits like a stock or a stone, perfectly unconscious of everything that is going on around him. He does not know a word that is uttered. He does not know what the children are about. Everything is a perfect mystery to him. You can readily see, as everybody can, that the deaf-mute child cannot get any education there. He may learn a little of some things; he may learn to add a few figures; he may learn to write a few words, and to write his own name, but that is all. There can be no education; the mind cannot be

brought out ; he cannot get any knowledge. He can get no knowledge of history, geography or grammar. That is a mystery far beyond the teacher's capacity, and it is a mystery which the child, under such circumstances, can never fathom. I say, then, that the only way in which these two deaf and dumb children in my native town could have been educated was by sending them away from home. I admit that it is sometimes a grief to the parents to part with their children, but when they know that those children can be educated at the institution, they willingly consent to send them there, in the confident belief that they will be taken care of. They see evidence that they can be taught, and that they will be restored to them after a lapse of time, educated and improved, prepared to be happy, prepared to be useful, and they make the sacrifice. We send our sons to college, not because we want to have them away, not because we are not aware of the temptations of college life ; we fear for them ; we have great anxiety ; but we send them away because there seems to be a necessity for it ; they must go there if they are to have a classical education ; and, notwithstanding all the disadvantages and dangers of the place, we make the sacrifice and send them away, hoping that they will derive great benefit from their connection with the college.

One of these children comes to us. He is awkward in his manners, awkward in his dress. He has bad habits sometimes. He has not learned to practice any of those conventional rules of politeness which we cultivated people deem so important. This child comes to us, his arm is perhaps over his eyes, but he will look out on one side and seems as though he had never seen anybody before, and had never been anywhere before, and possibly he never has ; very likely he has never gone away from the homestead or outside of the family circle ; but as he looks under his arm, he sees that there is a language going on there which he has seen before, a language which he can understand, and he takes courage ; pretty soon he begins to look around, and after a little while finds he is among friends. Everybody is kind to him. The old Roman custom of patron and client prevails in our institution. We will suppose that a little girl comes there. Some one says, "This little girl is from Massachusetts ; she came from Boston." Another girl starts up and says, "I am from Boston ; I will take care of this child." This older girl, who has been there four or five years, has become pretty well educated ; we call her a refined girl. She has changed in her appearance ; her manners are those of a lady ; you look into her face, and you see there evidence of intelligence ; there is a glow, a life and interest in every motion, as widely different, almost, from this little girl just come, as the most thoroughly refined and accomplished lady of

our country is different from that Esquimaux woman who was exhibited here some years ago by Dr. Hall. This little child is taken under the care of this older and more intelligent girl. She takes her as her friend. She teaches her. The child makes some awkward gesture, and she says, "Oh, you mustn't do that." Her hair is disheveled, and she puts it in trim, and adjusts her clothes. Her hands are not so white and clean as they should be, and she is taught to keep them clean. From that time, there are civilizing, refining and restraining influences brought to bear on that little child, up to the time when she leaves the institution. She looks at the signs of these other children. She sees that they make different signs from hers, and her signs become assimilated to theirs. Her signs were uncouth and awkward; she learns the signs of the community from this girl who has her in charge, and in a very little while she becomes a graceful child; her gestures are appropriate, she becomes clean and quiet in her habits, and at the end of a year, when her mother comes for her, she can hardly believe that that child is her daughter. "Is it possible that this child has improved so much in one year? Her manners, her appearance, everything about her, so different from what it was?" Well, sir, this process of education goes on, and in four or five years, this little girl is a genteel young lady, adopting, as the young ladies at the institution do, all the fashions of the city. It has been very amusing to me, in watching the habits of our children, to see how quickly they adopt a new style of dress or new arrangement of the hair. If the waterfall is beginning to flow, it will not be more than three or four days before every girl in the institution will have a waterfall, somehow or other; and whatever fashion prevails, they will adopt it—sometimes before I have noticed it in the streets. I say to the matron, "What is the matter with these girls' heads?" "Oh, that is the fashion about town." And so it is with their dress. Even that poor blind girl, Julia Brace, would go and feel of the ladies' dresses who came there, and if she found they had got something a little different from what she had, she would go to the matron and nothing would pacify her until her dress was changed so as to look like that of the ladies who came to visit her. Nothing gratifies us so much as the expressions of parents when they come to the institution at the end of the course, and find their boys and girls improved in manners, in expression, and in appearance, so much beyond anything they had expected or contemplated. This alone is sufficient to repay them for all the trouble and expense, setting the education aside.

Now, I contend that this is the result of aggregation. It is the result of bringing these children together in a special institution, where they can be educated. Not simply where they can learn language, but

where they can learn manners, where they can get good habits, where they can get proper ideas of dress, of neatness, and of appearance. Mr. Stone has already told you of the industrious habits which are cultivated, and of the occupations pursued, which fit them for usefulness and self-support, and without which they would be, instead of a blessing to their parents and friends, a great calamity and a curse.

Adjourned to Wednesday morning at 9½ o'clock.

FOURTH HEARING.

WEDNESDAY, February 6.

The Committee met at 9½ o'clock, and Mr. TURNER resumed his address. He said—

The point which I endeavored to make last when I addressed you yesterday was, that this calamity of deafness is not intensified as it has been represented, and in no way made more peculiar as an affliction by the association of the deaf and dumb in a special institution; or, in other words, from the fact of bringing them together in large numbers. On the contrary, (and that is the ground which I now maintain, and I have one or two more remarks to make on that point,) we believe that the association of the deaf and dumb, those who are to be educated with those who are far advanced in education, has a very beneficial effect upon the new pupils, and upon the whole community. I mentioned the effect in regard to their manners, their dress, their habits of neatness and good behavior, in the curing of any defective habits, in the performance of the ordinary duties of life, their appearance at table, and the manner in which they treat those with whom they associate—those little acts of courtesy and respect which it is proper for children to pay to other members of the family. Many of our young children come from rude, perhaps ill-trained families, but under the influences I have mentioned they lose these boorish habits, as they may be called, and acquire the habits of children who are brought up in respectable, well-educated and well-trained families. We are very much struck with the change, and so are the parents who leave their children with us to be taught, when they see them again, with the great improvement that has been made in their manners and general appearance.

My next point is, that there is great benefit resulting to the new pupils from being brought into a community of educated deaf and dumb, in a literary point of view, as regards improvement in the acquisition of language. In addition to what they learn in the school-room, our pupils acquire a very considerable amount of knowledge during the time they remain with us, by intercourse with educated deaf-mutes. The older ones impart the knowledge which they have to the younger ones, and nothing is more common than to see in their sitting-room in the evening, or on their play-ground, one of the more advanced pupils, who is well informed and can read the newspapers, reading some piece of news to the other pupils. Especially was this the case during the war, when

one of our educated pupils would gather a circle around him, and tell them, in their own familiar language of signs, of some battle, or other news of the day. In this way, our deaf and dumb children are kept as well posted up in the occurrences of the day, and in the events transpiring in other parts of the country, and even in foreign countries, as any hearing and speaking children in our common schools. Thus small children, long before they could get a knowledge of these facts by reading the newspapers,—because they have not sufficient knowledge of language to do that,—get it by association and intercourse with educated deaf-mutes, those who are more thoroughly educated, and those who have nearly completed their course. But I do not mean to press that point now.

Then, gentlemen, there is another advantage in these special schools ; and by special school, as deaf and dumb teachers and writers now use the term, is understood an institution exclusively established for the instruction of the deaf and dumb. They are assembled together from various sections of the country, in numbers more or less large, and taught either by articulation or by signs. These are special institutions ; that is, they have no other class but the deaf and dumb. Another advantage, I say, is the improvement which these children are able to make in a special institution, in a literary point of view, by evening study, and the superintendence which is afforded them at that time. During a considerable portion of the year, our children spend two hours every evening in study, and during the other portion of the year one hour and a half ; the smaller ones only an hour, for that is thought sufficient for them. Each evening in the week except Saturday they are assembled in their sitting-room, which is well lighted and warmed, and properly ventilated, and at the appointed hour for study, each boy (I now speak of the boys ; it is the same with the girls,) is in his seat, with his book, and studying the lesson prescribed by his teacher in the afternoon. A teacher superintends these evening exercises. The classes are usually arranged eight or nine at a table, on different sides, and the teacher moves round among them, and whenever a pupil finds a word he does not understand, and is not able to consult his dictionary,—because he does not know language well enough to find the meaning of the word from the dictionary,—the teacher spells the word for him ; and if he is far enough advanced, spells the definition of a synonyme that he knows will be understood. If not, he explains the word by the natural language of signs. To illustrate : Here is the word, “Joiner.” A pupil does not remember to have seen that word before. He points it out to his teacher. “What’s that ?” If he can understand, the teacher will tell him, “A man who makes houses.” If he is a small boy, the teacher will make signs to explain the meaning of the word. Then the child

can not only spell the word, but he has something by which he is able to retain it in his memory. He has connected the meaning of this word with a house, and that association helps him to remember the word, and he can reproduce it; and in the morning, when his teacher asks him what a joiner is, he is very proud to tell him, "A man who builds houses." He is delighted to think that he has conquered a literary difficulty, and made progress in learning. The acquirements of these pupils, therefore, are not confined to the school-room. They get a great deal of knowledge from association with more advanced pupils, and by this evening study under the supervision of a teacher.

Now contrast this with the condition of the deaf and dumb child who is brought into a neighborhood where there is a school and boarded in some family. His school hours are, say from nine to twelve and from two to four. The boy goes into this family a perfect stranger. The heads of the family do not know anything about signs; they do not know how to teach articulation. The boy is a mute; he hears nothing; he says nothing. (For I am talking in all I say of legitimate deaf-mutes, not about semi-mutes.) The woman, when he comes in, asks him if he will take off his hat and sit down. He knows nothing of what she says, and stands like a block. Then, perhaps, she points to a chair, and the boy sits down. When it is time for him to eat, they go to him and say, "Come and get your dinner." He does not understand a word, and they are obliged to take hold of him and point to the next room or to the dinner table, and he takes his seat. Do they want to ask him if he will have beef or pork? How can they ask him? They can point to a certain dish, and if he shakes his head he means that he does not want it. You will understand that all his intercourse is by signs; there is no other way; he can do nothing except by signs. He is obliged to take what is put before him. If he was at home, he would tell his mother he didn't like that, and wanted something else. Evening comes. He has learned certain lessons at school, but he does not understand them, and he naturally looks to the man and his wife for assistance; but they do not know any more than he does. What help can he get from this family, in which he is merely a casual boarder? They have their business to attend to. The moment the man gets his breakfast he goes to his work. He comes home to dinner, and in the evening, fatigued with his day's labor, he cannot trouble himself with the tedious process of teaching this boy articulation. He has failed to learn to articulate at home, where father and mother and all the family have been most anxious to teach him to speak, if possible, and they have decided that it is impossible, having failed to accomplish anything in that direction, and they have sent him away to this school, where they hope he will learn. Thus unfavorably would the deaf and dumb child

be situated on this plan of boarding him alone in a family who have no interest in him. They know nothing about these processes; they can do him no good; and naturally the mute becomes muter and the deaf deafer. In this family, with no deaf-mutes with whom he can communicate, with no one to whom he can make a sign, with no communication with any living being, he is as thoroughly isolated as Robinson Crusoe was on that island in the far-off ocean. And this is the plan that is proposed for the improvement of our deaf and dumb! On the contrary, when the deaf and dumb child comes to our institution, he finds a matron and assistants, all of whom are kind to him, conversant with his class of people, and they begin to make signs at once: "Are you not tired? Don't you feel weary and worn out with your journey? You have come a long distance, don't you want something to eat?" He understands all that, and he feels, almost from the moment of his arrival, at home. There is scarcely any home-sickness. We do not pretend to say these little children, sent away from their homes at the early age of eight years, are never home-sick; there is now and then one; but, as a general thing, they feel at home almost at once, and in a few days the spirit of happiness and contentment that pervades the institution rests upon them. Visitors are struck with no one thing more than with the cheerful and animated appearance of these children, associated together as they are in the institution, and under the care of the affectionate matron and her assistants, who treat them as their children.

In this connection, gentlemen, I want to read some resolutions passed by the graduates of the institution when they met at Hartford, last August, to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the arrival of Mr. Gallaudet and Mr. Clerc in this country, to introduce this system of instruction. Some four or five hundred assembled and spent two or three days in renewing old associations. Mr. Smith, the gentleman who has been here, delivered an oration which would have been creditable, as a specimen of scholarship and fine writing, to any of the graduates of our colleges. Other speeches were made, and various exercises gone through with, to the great edification of the hearing and speaking public who assembled to witness them. Everything was conducted with great propriety, as much so as if the graduates of Harvard College were to meet to celebrate the 250th anniversary of that institution. The day before they left they assembled together in the chapel of the institution, and these resolutions were proposed and passed unanimously. They were drawn up by one of their own number, and I read them to let you see how these pupils feel towards the matron who had the care of them during the whole course of their education:—

“Whereas, The Matron of the American Asylum, Mrs. Phebe C. White, a second mother to us all while at school, has shown, during our stay here, by her unobtrusive, yet plainly evident solicitude for our welfare and comfort, and by her untiring devotion to the oversight of the arrangements on which they depended, as well as by the cheerful smiles and kind words dispensed on all sides, that she has lost none of her maternal interest in us, her children of old; therefore,

“Resolved, That while we detest all mere forms and fulsome compliments, we do, from our hearts, invoke Heaven’s choicest blessings upon her, confident that our wish will be granted. May she long be spared to the work for which she is so well fitted, both by experience and nature. We cannot but thank the Great Father of us all that we had such a woman to take the place of our own mothers, and that we will cherish her memory till life shall fail us.”

To all this, I say “Amen.” That, gentlemen, is the sentiment of these graduates, and they speak the sentiment of their hearts, and the sentiment which these children, in this new home, in this special institution, entertain towards the mothers they find there. Now, do you suppose that any such feelings as these will be excited in the bosoms of these children towards those families into which they are taken as casual boarders, for so many dollars and so many cents a week, and where the heads of the family have no duties to perform except to bring them to the table, and give them a decent bill of fare? It is impossible. Such an arrangement would be an unnatural one. If tried, it will certainly be productive of no beneficial results, and, in my judgment, it will very soon be abandoned.

Let me allude for a moment to the subject of amusements. Where is this boy, in this isolated family, to find his amusements out of school? I will tell you where they find them in our school. The older pupils, those who have been there four or five years, have the routine of amusements all arranged. They have fine play-grounds—room enough—they have their Zouave company organized, in which all who have any taste in that direction can drill and march and countermarch, and occasionally exhibit themselves on the public park of the city in a uniform, which they have prepared for themselves, with the help of the matron and her assistants; and they make such an appearance that we are not ashamed, but rather proud, to have them go on the public park and show themselves to the citizens; and sometimes, in cases of public reviews, this Zouave company of deaf-mutes joins with the other military companies, and attracts quite as much attention as any of them. And, certainly, their military evolutions, under their famous captain, whom they had for several years, young Green, were wonderful. Every command was given by the motion of his sword. At one motion, they raised their muskets; at another, they filed off, and went through their evolutions, without any confusion whatever, and with as much accuracy

and precision as any company I ever saw. At the motion of their commander's sword, they were on their faces upon the ground; at another motion, on their knees, prepared for a charge or to fire; at another motion, on their feet again, and so through. Then they have their organized base-ball clubs, and perform all the evolutions in that now somewhat intricate game with as much precision as any of our base-ball clubs in the city. Then they have their kite-flying, and their bathing, which last is conducted under the supervision of one of the assistant-stewards, and all the ordinary amusements of children at any school. Their companions are their friends, their playmates, their schoolmates. We do not allow any outside boys to come on their ground to interfere with their plays. They have it all to themselves. We consider this much better than to have these boys mixing with the town boys, which might lead to quarrels, of which nobody could tell the consequences. We have them in charge constantly. Either the steward or one of the assistant stewards is on the ground to see that everything is conducted with propriety. We claim that this is one very great advantage of a special institution.

Then the girls have their play-ground, their tilts, (what used to be called "teter-boards" in old times,) their swings, their hoops, and various kinds of exercise; and they are encouraged to be out of doors a certain portion of every pleasant day, under the superintendence of the matron and her assistants.

The subject of their employments was alluded to and sufficiently explained by Mr. Stone yesterday, and therefore I will not speak on that point. I only want to refer to one other topic, which I just touched upon, I believe, yesterday. That is, the fact, that in a special institution the teachers are all specially qualified for their business. They have not been at a normal central school, and listened to a lecture or two, and received some little instruction in regard to the motions of the lips for three or four days, or a week, just to qualify them to make a beginning; but they have gone through a regular course of training, as Mr. Stone explained to you yesterday, day after day for a year. While I was Principal, scarcely a day passed, that some teacher did not come to my office to know how some idiomatic phrase could be best illustrated by signs; and I would spend five minutes with him, give him the explanation necessary, and then he would return to his duties. All the time, there is a necessity for the teacher, who is partially educated, to refer to those more advanced, or to the Principal, for special instruction in regard to difficulties of the system. There is no difficulty in teaching the deaf and dumb the names of common things, like a book, for instance; but when you come to speak of abstract words, such as "immortality," "eternity," what can you do? what can the teacher of a

district school do? what can any man do, who never has thought on this subject, in the way of giving an idea to the deaf-mute by signs, or by the motion of the lips, of a word like these? I do not say that it cannot be done. By a process of gradually going up to it from the less to the greater, it can be done, as it can be done in the case of hearing and speaking children, provided you have begun articulation with the child, and have got him so that he understands the meaning of words articulated up to that point. In the case of semi-mutes, that is not difficult; but I contend that in the case of a deaf and dumb child, of one who is absolutely deaf, absolutely dumb, and has always been so, a person who has not been specially instructed can no more get an idea of such words as I have named into the mind of that child, than he can fly with those waxen wings that the man in old times fastened to his shoulders. He thought they would avail to bear him up to heaven, but he tumbled into the sea; and there the teacher would go who should attempt this difficult business without previous instruction.

On this point, the testimony of all teachers, both those who teach by articulation, as in the German schools, and those who teach by signs, as in the French and American schools, is uniform. I never heard a man who had been engaged five years in teaching the deaf and dumb say anything but this, that while there is much that is interesting in the work, as a laborious business it far exceeds any other branch of instruction, and far exceeds anything that he had imagined before he commenced it. I will read from a pamphlet which I hold in my hand, written by an advocate of the system of articulation in England [Mr. J. Copleston], what he says on this subject:—

“Under the most favorable circumstances, the instruction of deaf-mutes is far more fatiguing work for a teacher than is generally imagined, requiring energy, cheerfulness, capacity and cultivation on his part to insure success. The difficulties to be surmounted by the deaf-mute are incomparably greater than those encountered by five-sensed youth learning a foreign language, for the latter has already acquired the power of reasoning, while the former has everything to learn. We have the authority of Dr. Kitto, that it is a popular mistake to suppose that the loss of one's hearing is compensated by the extraordinary development and strength of the other senses.”

I have here also a pamphlet on the instruction of the deaf and dumb, by the Canon De Hearne, who has charge of the instruction of deaf-mutes and the blind in the Royal Institution at Brussels. Here is testimony from the institution at Rotterdam. Mr. Molewater, in a discourse pronounced in 1854, on the occasion of an exhibition of the pupils of this establishment, speaks very particularly on the subject of the difficulty to be encountered in teaching articulation, and he says that it is on account of the difficulty of articulation that this instruction has

enjoyed a "subordinate role," as he expresses it, in the education of deaf-mutes. It does not stand so high, he says, in the estimation of teachers of deaf-mutes, because of the difficulty of it.

I will also refer you to the Report of the American Asylum for the year 1846, page 117. Mr. Weld, who visited these German schools, as stated by Mr. Stone, there says:—

"The testimony of German instructors is uniform in regard to the laborious nature of their employment, especially the teaching of articulation. Mr. Moritz Hill, (whose interesting publications are spoken of by teachers generally in Germany as exhibiting the best and most practical view of their system,) in his 'Complete Directions for the Instruction of Deaf and Dumb Children in Mechanical Speaking, Observation of the Organs, and Reading,' presents the subject, I think, in its true light. We find in this work, 'Remarks and Hints for Instruction in Speaking and in Reading the Countenance,' detailing *the difficulties* attending the latter; 'On the Defects of the Organs of Speech;' 'On the Observation of the Organs;' 'On the Requisites on the part of the Scholar and those on the part of the Teacher;' and on various other topics of much interest; all which furnish a great amount of evidence as to the laborious and exhausting nature of the undertaking."

Mr. Weld also quotes from Mr. Hill, (a man of reputation in this department,) as follows:—

"Besides these, [detailing the various necessary qualifications of a teacher,] the teacher needs an *infinite patience*, because on this depends, not only cheerfulness in this instruction, which does not require exertion from the scholar, but also, because the purity, the correct elevation and strength of sounds, especially of the vowels, depend on a quick turn of mind in the scholar."

Mr. Weld adds—

"Mr. Hill informed me in conversation, that he found his employment extremely exhausting, especially so much and such laborious speaking; and that his general health was suffering much from this cause. A similar reason was assigned to me by the head of another German school for his having some time before entirely broken down in health, and remained long in a nervous and feeble state, and for the frequent recurrence of bodily infirmity. Yet the school of Mr. Hill was limited to twenty-five pupils, and he had ample assistance; and the other had never contained but twelve, who had the labors of three instructors."

Now, in our school, where we teach by signs, our classes assigned to each instructor number from fifteen to twenty. We call fifteen a small class, eighteen about the desirable size, and some classes have twenty and even exceeding that.

Mr. Weld goes on to say—

"All this effort, care, watchfulness, patience, this teaching to imitate sounds and to understand the movements of the organs of speech, requires *time*, much

time and precious time, and this I must think can be, and in general ought to be, better employed in storing the minds of the pupils with useful knowledge, and in making them acquainted with the language of books, without reference to the methods by which hearing people utter or understand articulate language."

It has always been the policy of the Hartford institution to keep a teacher as long as possible; since it requires some three years to train him and fit him to go alone, as we say. When he has attained that point of perfection and proves a useful teacher, devoted to his work, it is with the most extreme reluctance that the officers of the institution consent to give him up. We have very frequent applications to furnish Principals for some of the new institutions at the West; and when we can do that without too great a sacrifice, we do it. But even under those circumstances, we feel very unwilling to lose one of our best teachers, and, if possible, we avoid such a necessity. It is a fact, therefore, that many of our teachers devote the labor and energy and strength of their lives to the education of the deaf and dumb at that institution, until age renders them unequal to the labor, or until (as is more frequently the case,) they are entirely worn out.

I will not now dwell any longer upon this point, but will conclude what I have to say by noticing some of the points made by the gentlemen who advocate the removal of the deaf and dumb from the institution at Hartford.

It has been said that we began upon a wrong principle, in not admitting pupils to the institution at an earlier age. When we first commenced, we required a child to have arrived at the age of twelve years before he came there. I alluded to that subject yesterday, and gave the reason for it. Some of the States at first sent their pupils for only four years. They thought that, as long as it took young men only four years to go through college, four years would certainly be long enough to teach a deaf and dumb child, who did not know his a, b, c, everything embraced in a common-school education. Some of the States generously allowed five years, and that remains, I believe, to this day, the limit in regard to the pupils from some of the States. We had no objection to taking pupils at an earlier age if we could have them long enough to complete the course of education; but it will be readily seen, and I think admitted by everybody, that if we can have only five years to teach any boy, whether he can hear and speak or not, it is better to wait until his mind is somewhat developed before we begin. Suppose you begin at the age of six and finish his course at the age of eleven, he leaves you just at the time when his mind is sufficiently developed to comprehend the importance of education. A child does not begin to comprehend what the object of education is, what all this training and

discipline are for, until he is eleven or twelve years old. Shall we then dismiss him and say, "Your education is finished; now shift for yourself?" I think no one will say that it would be wise, if we had but four or five years to devote to the education of any child, to take that child at the age of six and complete his education at ten or eleven. We chose, therefore, one of two evils. It was an evil that we had so little time, but it was an evil we were obliged to submit to, for public sentiment had not risen above that point. We therefore chose to take the children at the age of twelve, when their minds were somewhat matured. And here I will mention one fact. The minds of the deaf and dumb are not so early matured as those of other children. Hearing and speaking children learn a thousand and one things by their daily intercourse with parents and friends, by conversation and by questions. Hundreds and thousands of questions these little ones will ask, and they cannot be put off; nothing will turn them aside. Hearing and speaking children are continually asking questions and getting information, and by the time they are ten years old their minds are quite mature. They have a large amount of knowledge, not very well classified to be sure, but they know a great many things. The deaf and dumb child has had no process of development carried on with him. He has been shut up mostly at home,—his parents do not like to carry him about with them much,—often, they feel as though they did not want their neighbors and friends to know that they have had such a misfortune in their family, and they never speak of this little deaf boy, never carry him about much, and they explain scarcely anything to him. The consequence is, that he grows up to the age of eight or ten years, with his mind undeveloped, except by his powers of observation. He uses his eyes to good advantage; and what he can comprehend he learns well and remembers; but beyond that his mind has not been called out. His mental powers are dormant, and he goes to the school with but very little more mental development than he had at the age of four. We do not wish, therefore, to take these deaf and dumb children at the age of four or six, if we can have them only five years. If we could have them ten years under our instruction, we should not object to it; and therefore, I must say, (and this was the feeling of Mr. Gallaudet, it was the feeling of Mr. Weld, my predecessor, it was my feeling the whole time I was in charge of the institution, and it is the feeling of my successor and every teacher of the deaf and dumb, so far as I know,) I must say, that considering the time we can have the pupils there, the movement in Massachusetts a long time ago to reduce the age from twelve to eight was a serious damage to the institution and to the pupils you have sent there.

In addition to that, there is another reason—as suggested now by my friend—why we prefer that they should not come there early. We

want them to remain at home until they shall have reached an age when they will not be liable to be attacked by measles, whooping-cough, scarlet fever, or any of the diseases incident to childhood, and be free from dangers of that kind, away from home, and more free from interruptions than otherwise would be the case in their school employments.

Now, let me say, in regard to all these methods for the early training of the deaf and dumb, in little schools, neighborhood schools, family schools, district schools, if you please,—for they can certainly learn to write and make figures there,—we have no objection to any of them ; we wish them God-speed ; only (and here I wish to make a sharp exception,) we do not wish you, gentlemen, nor anybody else, to entertain for a moment the idea that these early efforts, these miscellaneous efforts, so to speak, these casual efforts, are going to accomplish anything in the way of perfecting the education of the deaf and dumb. Not at all. They only call out the powers of the mind ; they develop the intellect of the child ; they are a very good preparation for the special institution. When they come there they will come under superior advantages, and be better prepared to comprehend the course of instruction, and improve the time while they are there. We have been very much struck with this, in regard to the children of deaf and dumb parents who have been admitted to the institution. This calamity, as you know, is perpetuated sometimes. Where both parents are deaf and dumb, they are very much more likely to have deaf and dumb children than other people. In fact it is very probable, that if both parents are congenital deaf-mutes, a considerable proportion of their children will also be deaf and dumb. Facts have shown that this is the case. If they lose their hearing in infancy, and marry and have children, there is no more danger that those children will be deaf and dumb than yours or mine ; but if born deaf and dumb, there is a probability that nearly one-half the children of such marriages will be deaf and dumb. There are some exceptions to this, however, even where both parents are deaf and dumb. To return to the point on which I was speaking. We have noticed this fact with regard to the children of those deaf and dumb parents who have been educated. They commence with them when they are quite young, just beginning to make little signs to make known their wants. They spell to them their names, and little words like “hat,” “dog,” “bird,” “milk,” and so on ; and these little fellows learn a good deal. I remember that on one occasion, when I exhibited some of the pupils of the institution in this room, to show what could be done by parental care and teaching in this regard, I brought a little boy, four years old, by the name of Marsh, (whose father and mother were deaf and dumb, and lived in Boston,) upon the platform, and he wrote, “cat,” “dog,” “hat,” &c., from signs, with great ease, evidently feeling

(which was the fact,) that he was doing something wonderful. We have been very much gratified at the condition of the children of these deaf and dumb parents, when they have come to the institution, because we have found that they have acquired quite a large stock of single words, and learned to spell some little phrases, as, "How do you do?" "I am well," and so on, and are prepared to take hold of books, and go on with much greater rapidity than they would if they had not had this previous training. Understand, therefore, gentlemen, that we are in no way inimical or opposed to any of these movements for the early training of the deaf and dumb. We regard it as a thing proper to be done ; as a very great advantage to those who come to the institution afterwards ; but we do not regard it, we cannot regard it, as answering the purpose of this institution, or as in any way completing the education of these deaf-mute children. In this particular, I find that all the authorities in Germany and in England, and wherever I have had any opportunity to consult them, agree with me entirely. The Canon de Hearne, from whose work, published in Brussels in 1855, I quoted a moment ago, speaking of these attempts to teach the deaf and dumb in families and in common schools, says : "Its friends claim that in Belgium, Sweden, Denmark, most of the German States, and in Paris itself, experience has demonstrated the good effects of the system of Blanchet. But there is nothing in it, and this assertion has been nullified by a correspondence which has been carried on between the professors of the Royal Institution at Paris and the heads of the institutions of the countries named, which correspondence has been published without being contradicted. In the answer of the Canon Carton to Mr. Vaisse, of Paris, he said, 'There is not an institution of the deaf and dumb among us which has been supplanted by the instruction of the common school teachers. No one has ever dreamed, in Belgium, that this idea will be realized. The ordinary teachers can be put in a condition to co-operate advantageously in the instruction of the young deaf-mutes of their district, and by their co-operation they can shorten the time necessary for the special instruction of these unfortunates in our institutions ; but the intention to entirely abolish these institutions could never have entered the head of any but a visionary enthusiast. My profound conviction is, that the suppression of special institutions would be a public calamity.'" (pp. 254, 255.)

"The Abbé Carton, in a work on the instruction of deaf-mutes to be carried on by primary teachers and parents, addresses a chapter to the former, purporting to demonstrate, that though they can render much service to deaf-mutes, mixed in their classes with other pupils, they can in no wise supply the place of the special instructors, as some philanthropists have imagined, contrary to the opinion of all men conversant with the subject. Such is the opin-

ion (says De Hearn) which I gave in a discussion of this important question which took place Dec. 2, 1864, in the Chamber of Representatives." (p. 243.)

Among other things to the same effect, he says :—

"The teachers of common schools have not often the time to introduce the method of this instruction, neither the time of making application of it with the requisite assiduity."

Mr. Stone referred to the fact, that in the English schools, (and the same remark has been made with regard to the German, and some of the French schools, where articulation was attempted), this system of teaching by articulation has been growing into disuse. I want to call your attention to an English authority, simply to show that Mr. Stone is supported by an advocate of the system of articulation. Mr. Copleston, in his pamphlet, refers to Hawkins's work on "The Constitution of the Deaf and Dumb," and says :—

"Mr. Hawkins thus dispassionately alludes to the disuse of this valuable means of instruction :—'Teaching by articulation, we fear, seems to be gradually falling into neglect in our British establishments. The Braidwoods, the Watsons, and those of their followers who made themselves thoroughly acquainted with the anatomy and nature of speech, have often succeeded where the exciting source of vocal power was almost aphonous. In them, the art culminated, and it has since, for lack of attention to it, greatly declined.'"

While I am on this subject, I want to refer to some of the efforts that have been made in our own country, and have been brought forward as proof of the facility with which the deaf and dumb can be taught to articulate, and the ease with which people who have had no special instruction can teach their children to articulate. At one of the hearings before this Committee, a letter was read from a gentleman in New London County, Conn., who was represented to be the father of a son born deaf, and of course dumb, whom he had taught to articulate, and articulate very well—the father being a butcher, and nothing more than a common man. That letter recalled to my mind an event which occurred in Connecticut many years ago, and which was reported at the first convention of the teachers of the deaf and dumb, which met at New York in 1850. You will find the incident recorded on the 142d page of the report of the proceedings of that first convention. In a paper read there by Dr. Peet, it was stated that some of those old Spanish teachers, hundreds of years ago, Peter Ponce, for instance, and others, professed to have wrought wonderful effects in their teaching of the deaf and dumb. One of the teachers present, a member of the convention, suggested that these accounts should be taken with some degree of allowance; and then went on to relate an occurrence that took place in

Hartford some years before. There was a national convention of common school teachers held in Hartford in 1844, I think, but I cannot say certainly as to that. However, it was about the time when Mr. Mann,—for whom I entertain, as a man of learning and a philanthropist, the highest respect,—returned from Germany, and expressed the opinion that the deaf and dumb should be taught articulation. Some one previously to that meeting of common school teachers in Hartford, had informed him that there was a lad in New London County, born deaf, who had been taught to articulate by his father, and could speak well, read well, read poetry, read from the lips, and was a specimen of what might be done by any intelligent man in the education of deaf and dumb children. Mr. Mann secured the attendance of that father and his son, who was then a young man about 17 or 18 years old, at this convention, that he might show there, in the very seat of the beast, where all the instruction was by signs, and where of course an argument of that kind would have a telling effect, the result of efforts to teach a child to articulate by a poor, uneducated man in the State of Connecticut. This teacher, who related the story, was present at the convention, and said that in the morning, the father and son made their appearance in the convention, and were treated with a great deal of attention—and deservedly so, if all was true that was said about them. At the proper time. Mr. Mann brought this subject before the convention, and said he wished particularly to call attention to it, as he was now interesting himself very much in the subject of an introduction of articulation, as a mode of instruction, into the schools of this country. Mr. Mann was a man of pure mind and character, and he never would have made that exhibition before that convention had he not supposed that the facts were just as they had been related to him. At the proper time, as I have said, he made his statement to the convention, and called upon this father to come forward with his boy and exhibit what he had done. He did so. He placed the boy in front of him, some distance off, and spoke to him in an audible voice, and spoke to him in a whisper. It did not make any difference; he could read from the lips; there is no mistake about that; he had certainly learned to read from the lips. The boy answered his questions promptly, and in a voice quite as distinct as Mr. Chamberlain's, whom I exhibited to you a fortnight since. He comprehended the questions put to him, and gave the answers without making any mistake. Then the father put a newspaper into his hands, and the boy read a paragraph in an audible voice, so that we could all understand; very different from the reading of Mr. Hubbard's little girl, whose enunciation, as you may have noticed, was not very distinct. He gave him some verses to read, and he read them very well, and everything appeared to be going off admirably. Well, this teacher who was

present—and one of the teachers of the deaf and dumb—saw all this, of course. He had nothing to say; but thinking there might be some room for further investigation, he invited this father and son to go home with him to dinner at the institution. The invitation was accepted, and on the way up he asked this father if his boy had been entirely deaf from birth—if he could hear anything? He said, perhaps, he could hear a very little; nothing worth speaking of; he was deaf enough. He asked him, “What evidence have you that he can hear at all?” He said that he saw him one day out in the orchard creeping along under one of the apple-trees, and then he lay down under it for a time. At last, he jumped up and came to the house with a very exultant expression on his countenance, and said that for the first time in his life he had heard a bird sing in the apple-tree. The teacher thought that a boy who could hear a bird sing in an apple tree, could not have been, at that time, very deaf. “What other proof have you?” He said that one evening the boy was sitting by an old-fashioned wood fire, and all at once he put his ear down to the hearth and seemed to be trying to find out something; and after a good deal of observation and search, he at last discovered that there was a cricket in the hearth that was chirping, and he was very anxious to find out where it was. The teacher thought if the boy could hear a cricket in the hearth, he could not be very deaf. Then the teacher said, “Wouldn’t you like to go into the dormitory to see the city?” He said he would, and the teacher took him up to a large window, and while they were looking at the city, the teacher said to the father, “Don’t you believe I can make this boy hear if I put my mouth pretty close to his ear and speak to him?” “Well, I don’t know but you can.” The teacher put his mouth pretty near the boy’s ear, being careful not to let him see his lips, and said, “How do you like the looks of the city?”—not louder than I speak now, (moderately loud and very distinct.) “First-rate,” said the boy. “Were you ever in Hartford before?” “Never.” “How long do you expect to stay here?” “I don’t know; father can tell.” “Would you like to go home to-day?” “Oh, no, I would like to stay and see these things.” The teacher said nothing, but previous to the opening of the convention in the afternoon, he intimated to the chairman, (Mr. Swann of this city, I think, but I am not quite sure,) that he had a few words he would like to say in reference to the exhibition that was made in the morning by the deaf and dumb boy. They came together at 2 o’clock, and the chairman announced to the convention that there was a gentleman present who would like to make a few remarks. This teacher came forward and said there were many cases of deaf and dumb persons who had partial hearing. Some could hear very loud noises, but could not hear the human voice. Others, again, could hear the tones of the human voice

when loud, but did not have hearing enough to make that sharp distinction in the sounds that was necessary in order to imitate them. Then, again, there were others who could hear pretty well, without seeing the human lips; and the teacher said, he had pretty good reason to believe that the boy exhibited in the morning was one of that class, and he would like to make the experiment, if the convention would give him permission. They did so. The boy was called forward, and took his stand where everybody could see him, and the teacher put his face so that this boy could not see the motion of his lips, only hear the tones, and repeated the questions he had put in the dormitory, and the boy answered as before. Well, the convention saw in a moment that this boy could hear any question put to him and answer intelligently from the sound of the voice, and the thing dropped, to use a common expression, "like a hot cake." The father and boy, who were lions in the morning, were pretty small cubs in the afternoon, and they disappeared without our knowing what became of them. Gentlemen, that man who taught his deaf and dumb boy was Mr. Whipple, the butcher, whose letter you heard the other day, the boy was the same "Enoch," of whom he wrote, and the teacher was the gentleman who now addresses you. So, gentlemen, we are to receive these stories and these accounts of the wonderful results effected by common men, with common means, with a great many grains of allowance. Any one who is curious to see the account of this matter, will find it in the report of the Convention held in New York in 1850, and if any witness is needed, the Rev. George E. Day, who is considered, I believe, a pretty good authority in this Court, was present and witnessed the whole thing.

Let me say one word more on this subject. Mr. Mann was as much imposed upon as the convention. He had had no opportunity to investigate this matter; he received it from common report; and supposed that the facts were exactly as they had been represented to him. He was the last man in the world to have brought forward an imposition of that kind, had he known the facts.

Mr. MILLER. I would inquire if the boy was represented as entirely deaf?

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. Was it supposed by the convention that the father was an impostor?

Mr. TURNER. No, sir; nor anybody, until after this exposure was made. After that exhibition, nobody made any pretence that he had accomplished any more than any man could accomplish.

Prof. BARTLETT. Was not the father of the boy partly deceived?

Mr. TURNER. I asked him how he had taught this boy—what the processes were. "Why," said he, "I got him pretty near to me. I

mouthed it out, and I shouted it out, and he learned to speak. That is all I can tell about it." I guess that was the whole of it—especially the "shouting it out."

Mr. DUDLEY. Had any one else had anything to do with teaching him to speak?

Mr. TURNER. I do not know. I suppose he was taught in the family. "Mr. Mann (the report says) called the attention of the meeting, in reply to a question that was asked, to a young man from New London County, Connecticut, who was present, and who was said to have been born deaf and dumb." That was Mr. Mann's statement. His father, however, he said, had succeeded in teaching him to read and write; and Mr. Whipple, the father of the youth, was introduced to the notice of the convention, and was called upon to state the processes by which he had been enabled to teach his son to read and speak. He stated that his son was born deaf and dumb.

Mr. HUBBARD. Is there anything to show he was not born deaf and dumb?

Mr. TURNER. Only the fact, that he could hear very well when I saw him at the age of 17. Mr. Whipple states in this letter that he has "found but few mutes who can hear none; almost all of them can hear some." In that particular he is mistaken. You see the gentleman is no great philosopher, after all. He says, "The only cause why the deaf do not speak is, they don't know how." I would ask if hearing children know how when they are born? How do they learn? They learn through hearing. It is by hearing oral sounds that children learn to imitate them. Very likely the motion of the lips may guide a little child somewhat. Perhaps in that way you may enable him to speak more plainly; but it is mainly by hearing. How do you teach blind children to speak? They never see the motion of the lips. They learn from hearing the sound. It is the vocal utterances of the parents that little ones learn. That is what they depend upon.

Mr. HUBBARD. Did you ever know a mute child?

Mr. TURNER. Never, unless he was an idiot. We have had several children brought to the institution who had no speech, and who were supposed to be deaf and dumb. They turned out to be weak in intellect—with not wit enough to learn to speak. I have tried several very interesting experiments with these children. I could teach them to spell on the fingers, but could not teach them to articulate, and could teach them to write two or three words from the signs. One of these weak-minded children knew the sign name of every boy in the institution, and yet I could not succeed in making him speak a word. That idiot boy could make signs and thus communicate; but I never knew him to attempt conversation by signs except when one of the boys had

been breaking a rule, that would render him liable to punishment. In that case, he would be very apt to run and tell of it. I never knew him to make any communication under any other circumstances.

MR. SANBORN. I think I ought to say, in justice to Mr. Whipple, that we are prepared to show that so far from his being an impostor, and pretending to have done a thing which he did not do, he is one of the most honest and upright men in the world, and has always stated that his son had some hearing. He has not regarded this as anything remarkable at all. He has simply gone on in a natural way, and given a boy, situated as some of the pupils at Hartford are at the present time, the power of reading on the lips, which certainly cannot be acquired by hearing. Reading on the lips is something entirely distinct from that. I am confident that Mr. Turner would not make the accusation that he was an impostor.

MR. TURNER. Did I say that I made any accusation? I told the facts, and left every one to make his own inference.

MR. SANBORN. That was the implication.

MR. TURNER. I cannot help that. I said in this report that the father was certainly entitled to much credit for teaching his son to read from the lips; and certainly he is deserving of much credit. I have no doubt the father did not understand the case. He is not a philosophical man; he did not inquire into the causes; he found this child was not learning to articulate at the proper age, and found that he was partially deaf. Then he spoke louder to him, and the boy began to learn, from the sound of his voice; and at the same time, when the father spoke loud and made these distinct motions of the lips, that helped the boy to learn. But I say, that that boy had hearing enough to learn to articulate just as well as any other child. I could communicate with him upon any subject, and he understood any communication I made to him through the ear as well as any gentleman in this room. I do not say the father was an impostor; he may have been mistaken. I know Mr. Mann was, for he would never have exhibited a hearing boy there, if he had known it. He never contended for a moment, after that exhibition, that that father had taught his boy by the motion of the lips, or thought of bringing that case forward as a case in point. He was thoroughly convinced that that boy had hearing enough to understand the tones of the voice; and receive any oral communication that should be made to him; and he must have inferred, as every man must in his senses, that a boy having that degree of hearing must have learned to speak through his ear. I do not say he was an impostor. I do not wish to produce any impression of that sort. I only say, that many people, with the best intentions, who intend to state facts as they are, are deceived in this matter. They do not investigate; they are

not philosophical; they have not an inquisitive turn of mind; they do not turn the stone over to see what is on the other side; they simply take things as they appear, and as they are related by the common people round. That boy was deaf, very deaf, but not so deaf that he could not hear. We had one boy who came from Springfield, who could hear quite well. I said to him, "What on earth did you come here for? You can learn in the common school." "I know I can," said he; "I ain't half as deaf as father is. They wouldn't teach me at the speak school; the teacher wouldn't learn me anything, and I have come here to learn." And he did learn considerable. He learned by signs, too, aided by the speaking and hearing powers that he had. It is not true that we have many in the institution,—I do not know that we have any,—who can hear as well as the boy Whipple could. There is Miss Foster, and one young man by the name of Branch, who could hear when they came there, and the girl has greatly improved in her hearing, and can hear pretty well.

MR. SAWYER. This father, of whom you have spoken, exhibited his son as a deaf and dumb boy after he had become convinced that he could hear a bird sing and a cricket chirp?

MR. TURNER. Yes, sir. He stated before this convention of teachers that his son was "born deaf and dumb." That was his expression. I have the record here, which any gentlemen can see, if he chooses. At any rate, it is entirely corroborative of the story I have told.

MR. WRIGHT. You would not leave the impression that the father intended to deceive any one?

MR. TURNER. No, sir; I would not. I think very likely he was deceived himself. That the boy had heard, at some time, he knew very well, or else he would not have told me what he did.

MR. WRIGHT. Did he tell the convention that his son had never heard?

MR. TURNER. Before the convention, he said that he had "mouthed it out and shouted it out." I got that confession from him at the convention, so that I thought the "shouting" had something to do with it.

I want now to call your attention to the objection that has been made, that we did nothing at the Hartford Asylum until we were constrained to it by outside influences. On the return of Dr. Howe and Mr. Mann from Germany, they commenced an agitation of the subject of teaching the deaf and dumb by articulation, as the general mode of school instruction. I cannot too often repeat the remark I have already made, that between the deaf and dumb and the semi-mute there is a marked and sharp distinction; and I do not wish any of my arguments to be applied to the latter. They are a class by themselves. They can be taught more or less by articulation; and even if they were to be put into an articulating

school, they might be educated—especially such young men as Smith and Chamberlain. The work, though difficult, would be comparatively less laborious. But I am speaking now about those born literally and truly deaf, who have never used the voice in oral communication. With regard to this point, that we did not use any efforts in this direction previous to the time of which I have spoken, and were forced into it as a means of self-defence when Mr. Mann and Dr. Howe returned from Europe, I will say, that the French method of teaching, at the time when Mr. Gallaudet was at Paris and acquired the art, did not embrace articulation as a means of instruction, and as Mr. Stone has remarked to you, this system of instruction was not adopted and had no reference to the case of semi-mutes or those who could hear partially like this son of Mr. Whipple. We did not suppose it would be necessary to bring such persons to us for instruction; and the Abbé de L'Epee, who commenced this system of deaf-mute instruction, commenced it with two sisters who were born deaf, who had no language but the language of signs; and he formed his theory of instruction and built up the superstructure upon the idea, that it was designed solely for those who had no hearing and no speech. And so it was with our system. But I want to say, that previous to the exercise of this outside pressure to which Mr. Sanborn alludes, claiming that a great deal of credit is due to the gentlemen who engaged in that discussion for bringing us to the consideration of the question, (and I do not know but that is so; we will not deny that)—I say, that previous to that time, it appears that efforts were made to teach articulation. Mr. Weld, my predecessor, says in his report for the year 1845: "As early as the year 1822, I, myself, gave instruction in articulation daily for many months, in this institution, to a youth who lost his hearing at seven years of age, and at fifteen joined the school, retaining a considerable use of speech. The result was a marked improvement in articulation, which, I have reason to suppose, he continued to use satisfactorily to himself and his friends during the remainder of his life. There have almost ever since been persons of his class, pupils of the asylum, who have received more or less benefit from the occasional instruction given them while prosecuting their other studies." We did make efforts previous to the time spoken of, and it was a common practice for us to speak to these persons and to hear them speak, when they had any speech.

Now, in regard to the systematic effort which were made at that time. After Mr. Weld returned from Europe, he recommended to our directors that there should be direct efforts made to teach all the semi-mutes and semi-hearing pupils in the language of articulation. He was Principal at that time, and he immediately made an arrangement by which every teacher should devote his attention, for about twenty minutes or half an

hour every day, solely to this subject of hearing and articulating; to trying to teach the children to read from the lips and also to cultivate the voice; and in the case of those deaf and dumb teachers who happened to have children of this description in their classes, (which was the case then, for we do not claim to have made any discrimination,) those children were directed to leave their classes at this particular hour, and go into an adjoining room, taught by a hearing and speaking teacher, and take their seats with his pupils, who were semi-mutes, and there they were taught to articulate. Mr. Weld, himself, gave no instruction in regard to the methods to be pursued, and we were engaged during that time, each day, in teaching those children to articulate, in improving their articulation, and teaching them to read upon the lips. That practice was persevered in, I cannot say how long, but I think during the remainder of the time that Mr. Weld continued to be Principal. I will read what he says on this subject, and I deem it very important, for two reasons. First, to show that systematic efforts have been made in our institution and with very considerable success, to teach articulation, the results of which were recorded at the time. I hold in my hand the report made May 10, 1846. Mr. Weld says, on the twelfth page of this report, that, after having made these investigations on the subject of articulation in the German schools: "We then proposed to direct attention to those of our pupils who still retained some imperfect hearing, and to those who, having once spoken like other children, still retained some degree of articulation. The results thus far obtained in the prosecution of these purposes are worthy of notice. On these two classes of persons we have bestowed daily attention, with the success indicated in the statements which follow." There were, at that time, in the institution, eight pupils whom Mr. Weld designates by name as having made special improvement, and with whom this course of instruction ought to be persistently pursued. He says, "Many of the remaining cases were interesting and encouraging, but none so much as those who are here particularized." The second reason for calling your attention to this record is this: The first instance that he designates, and one we say of the most promising, is the case of our friend, Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Weld speaks of him in this way:—

"William M. Chamberlain lost his hearing entirely at about five years of age by the scarlet fever. He was admitted to the asylum when eleven years and ten months old, and retained at that time the ability to use articulately and freely the simple language of childhood. He could read and understand easy books, and express his thoughts intelligibly, though not very accurately, on common subjects, by writing. He could also read remarkably well on the lips of those who addressed him with care and deliberation. Still, he was gradually losing the power of distinct utterance, had great difficulty in ascertaining the

meaning of new words, and could not proceed in his education at home. His parents wisely judged that other means should be used to accomplish so desirable an object, and we are happy now to state that by those who are now employed at the asylum, he has in less than two years been placed beyond the probable danger of a relapse into his former difficulties. He will, without doubt, be able to prosecute his education to an indefinite extent, if faithful to himself and if judicious instruction be continued for a reasonable time. He need never become a mute, and will always be able, with special care, to understand common language, from the lips of others, when addressed directly to himself."

All these predictions of Mr. Weld, with regard to Mr. Chamberlain, have been exactly fulfilled. Mr. Weld puts him as No. 1. We would cite his case as a remarkable one of the retention of articulation, with perfect deafness. When I asked him the other day if he was entirely deaf, he said, "I think if you could stand in my shoes, you would think so." He says, he cannot hear anything. His is a remarkable case of reading with facility on the lips; and yet, when I asked him, "When you go into church and take your seat in front of the minister, say midway up the aisle, can you get the substance of the discourse?" He said, "No, I cannot." "Can you understand the ministers generally as they preach?" "A little of what they say, not thoroughly." "When, then, can you understand?" He said, "In the case of a man who speaks with a rounded enunciation, and has no whiskers or moustaches to plague me. I can get about the substance of his discourse. If I sit in a good position and can see his mouth, I can get the substance of his discourse." But, under ordinary circumstances, the minister turning round; and looking up and looking down, he can get but very little of it. I asked him, since I came into the room this morning, if he could follow my address to you, or whether he looked at Mr. Bartlett the most. He said, sometimes at one and sometimes at the other. "Could you understand generally what I said?" "No; I could understand considerable that you said, but a considerable portion of it I couldn't catch by the eyes, from the motion of your lips." He added this, "If I had been standing directly before you, and you had addressed yourself to me, I think I could have understood it." That is the difficulty. If there happens to be a little dimness of light in the evening, this mode of talking with the deaf and dumb is good for nothing. If they happen to be just the other side of the house, with the window open, but where they cannot see you, you may call until you are dumb yourself and you cannot make them hear anything. So you see that this mode of communicating with children and other persons is liable to a great deal of interruption, inconvenience and difficulty. And so also is the communication by signs; we admit that freely; and the only thing that these educated deaf and

dumb persons can rely upon with any degree of certainty, is communication by means of writing. They write a question; you know what it is, if you can read. You write the answer, and they know what that is; they can comprehend that. You cannot be sure when addressing them in any other way. They say that they *guess* at some words. I take a passage in French or Latin, and try to translate it. I understand the drift of the sentence, as we say, but there is occasionally a word that I do not understand, but I rather *guess* it must mean so and so, by the context; but, perhaps, on turning to the dictionary, I find that it means exactly the contrary, and that I have given a wrong interpretation entirely to the sentence because I did not get hold of the right meaning of one word. So with these persons, they may *guess* the wrong word, which will give a wrong turn to the whole sense of the communication.

I have only one other point, and then I have done. The claim is, that these persons who are educated at Hartford lose their knowledge of the language after they leave the institution. They will, if they do not practise it. I met yesterday the father of one of our pupils, and he said, "My son cannot understand language so well as he could when he came from school; he cannot write so well as when he came home fifteen years ago. The reason is, that he is such a worker, and is so intent upon his occupation, and upon availing himself to the fullest extent of his labor, (I guess the boy loves money a little,) that he has not taken any time to read. He comes home from his work at eight, nine, and sometimes ten o'clock at night, and wants his cup of hot chocolate, and then goes to bed. He does not care to take up a paper or a book. He does sometimes read the newspaper, but he says he cannot read to-day so well as when he left your school." That is an exception to the general rule. But how is it with those who learn to articulate? How is it with the pupils of the German schools? This is a subject which interested Professor Day, while he was there. He could see how well he could articulate when under the eye of the teacher, and how well they could read from the mouth of a teacher, where they were accustomed to read all the time. But he wished to ascertain whether this facility remained after the pupil left the school. He obtained the address of some of the most distinguished graduates of those schools, persons who had acquired articulation most successfully, and took the trouble to go and visit them after they had been out of school for some years. I will read you the result. I quote from the report of 1845. Mr. Day states:—

"In the list of dismissed pupils with which directors and teachers of deaf and dumb schools have furnished me, I have, in justice to them, invariably passed over those represented by them to be inferior in natural capacity, or to

have made but little progress. My object was rather to select those *above* than below the average. With these remarks, I submit the following statements of these examinations to the board.

"No. 1. A young man twenty-five years of age, under instruction six years, left the ——— Institution in 1833, bringing with him a written testimonial from the principal that he was the first or second scholar in the school. He was at work in a printing office, and the intelligent foreman remarked, that in conversation it was necessary to speak very slowly, in order to form each letter on the lips, and also to select the most simple words and phrases. He observed also that one would never think of holding a long conversation with him, as with other men, although, in a walk together, a simple conversation might be kept up. The other hands agreed in this. The young man was then called up, and a few simple questions put to him. The question how long he had been out of the institution, he did not understand, and one of the journeymen spelled the sentence by putting his finger on the different compartments of types before him. The communication of the foreman with him, although he made his signs for nearly every word, was very slow and difficult. The owner of the establishment, who came in at the latter part of the time, observed that his articulation was not as good as when he first came to him as an apprentice, three years before. He ascribed the falling off to the difficulty of communicating, and the consequent unwillingness of others to enter into conversation with him.

"No. 2. A young man, cabinet maker; had been out of the institution nine years. His employer says he cannot say his speaking has improved. Reads but little. In order to make him understand, it is necessary to repeat words several times, although easy and common sentences he can often seize the first time. Conversation with him is slow and tedious. Cannot understand all that he says. Resort must frequently be had to writing."

Mr. WRIGHT. These were semi-mutes?

Mr. TURNER. He does not say. They were graduates of institutions where all the teaching is professedly by articulation, but where they use signs to explain.

Professor Day cites nine of these cases, which were just about of this nature, and which I will not therefore read. There is one other, however, which I will read, where the pupil lost his hearing at six years of age. That is a case in point.

"No. 9. A young man twenty years of age, six years under instruction, and four years since dismissed from school at ———. Uncommonly intelligent. Lost his hearing at six years of age. His employer said that he could understand him and make him understand, as well as if he were a hearing man. This, however, from the specimens I saw, was exaggerated. From the motions of my lips, he was able to make out about two-thirds of what I said, and about the same proportion of what was said by him was intelligible to myself."

I only want to call your attention for a moment to the results of the education in our institution. I know I need not spend any time in

specifying those results. Our reports every year have come before you, and you have seen specimens of the compositions of our pupils, which are fair specimens of their ability to write at the ages indicated when the compositions were written. The report for this year, I believe, has already been distributed among the members of the Legislature, and you have thus been put in possession of specimens of the ability of pupils taught by signs to write, and to use written language. In the pamphlet of Mr. Copleston, from which I have quoted once or twice to-day, he says that not very many of the educated deaf and dumb have attained to eminence in literature and science. He speaks of two deaf and dumb men in modern times, who have made these eminent attainments. Of course, he knew nothing about these graduates of our institution. In fact, they are young men, and have not yet made their mark, as I trust many of them will. But it is a little remarkable that neither of the persons whose names he mentions was taught by articulation. Not one of all the graduates of these numerous German institutions does he cite as at all remarkable for his attainments in literature or in a perfected education. Neither does he cite a single English or Scotch pupil. And, mark you, this is an English writer, and the statement is made in a pamphlet the whole object of which is to advocate teaching by articulation. The two cases that he brings forward as the most remarkable cases of attainments in literature are those of Massieu and Clerc, two Frenchmen born deaf and dumb, not semi-mutes, both of whom were taught absolutely and wholly by signs, without the help of a single articulate utterance. Massieu and Clerc he selects out as the two finest specimens of scholarship that are to be found in the ranks of the graduates of any or all of these institutions. I was very much surprised at this, and very much gratified, that two sign-taught deaf-mutes should be singled out of the great multitude who had been educated, from the beginning of this instruction down to the present time, as the persons of the greatest literary attainments; singled out from the school of the Abbé Sicard, in France, whose only method was the sign language and finger alphabet.

MR. HUBBARD. Was Massieu taught by sign language or the manual alphabet?

MR. TURNER. By both. They were both taught by signs until they could understand enough of language to use the alphabet, and then the signs and the alphabet were used indiscriminately.

MR. HUBBARD. That was so with Massieu and Clerc?

MR. TURNER. Yes, sir; they were both taught by the Abbé Sicard. They were the two prominent pupils of the Abbé Sicard's school.

MR. HUBBARD. I have Massieu's name as one of those taught by

the manual alphabet, and not by signs. I have the authority of Dr. Kitto for the statement.

Mr. TURNER. He is entirely mistaken. Massieu was taught by both the alphabet and by signs. We have the evidence of Mr. Clerc, who was a pupil with him and an intimate friend.

I have made these statements to you, gentlemen, and detained you thus long, not because I have any interest in the institution, but because of my interest in the subject of deaf-mute education, to which my life has been devoted. I was connected with the institution at Hartford for more than forty-two years, but I have now ceased to have any connection with it, and have no interest in it further than I must necessarily have as the field of my labors for so many years. I do not appear before you as a feed attorney, to advocate the cause of education by signs, or the cause of the American Asylum. I came here simply at the request of my friend, Mr. Stone, with whom I have long been associated in these labors. I came, because I feel an interest in the deaf-mutes who are yet to be educated as well as those who have been educated, and because I feel an interest in Massachusetts, my native State, and desire that her children may continue to enjoy the advantages which the institution at Hartford affords, and that the connection which has so long and so happily existed between the State of Massachusetts and the American Asylum may be continued, unless, in your judgment, there are reasons presented in the arguments which may be laid before you for the adoption in part, at least, of some other method of teaching the deaf and dumb. The fact that the institution is where it is cannot now be helped. If we were to locate it anew, we might put it in a more central position in New England. Perhaps it would be better, but the fact that the advantages which it affords are offered to you on the same conditions that they are to Connecticut, must lead you, I think, unless you can clearly see that there are good and sufficient reasons for a change, to conclude to continue the relation which has existed so long. Then, I have another and a personal reason why I come before you. I do not wish, as I am now about to pass off the stage of life, as I have already passed from the stage of active usefulness,—I do not wish it to be thought by the gentlemen of this Committee, and by the intelligent gentlemen who compose the Legislature of Massachusetts, my native State, that I have wasted my life in fighting a reasonless fight; that I have been employed all my days in beating the air; that I have “labored in vain, and spent my strength for nought.” I wish it to be felt that my labors have been directed towards an attainable and an important object; that they have resulted in fruits that will remain to bless the unfortunate class whom I have instructed when the knowledge of my labors shall have passed away, and I shall have gone to my rest in the grave. I

wish it to be understood that I leave the stage of action under the full conviction that the system of instruction devised by the Abbé de L'Epée, perfected by the Abbé Sicard, introduced into this country by Gallaudet and Clerc, and which has been improved, perfected and persisted in until the present time by the successors of Gallaudet, is a judicious, a wise, a suitable, and the best mode of educating those who are born deaf, whose ears are forever closed to the utterances of the human voice.

Having made this exposition, gentlemen, whether I have accomplished the object I had in view or not, I shall retire under the belief that you will attach due weight to the arguments I have brought forward and the statements which I have made. If they are deserving of any consideration, if they have any weight, I leave them with you, assured that you will do us full justice, and that your sense of right and justice and your feelings of benevolence towards this unfortunate class of persons, will lead you to take such action as will be a source of satisfaction to you in the review hereafter, when you retire, as I already have, from the scenes and the business of active life.

Mr. CALVIN DAY, one of the directors of the American Asylum, then addressed the Committee. He said :—

After the very patient hearing which the Committee have given to the gentlemen who have appeared from Connecticut, I desire to occupy but a very little of your time, and upon two or three points with which I am possibly a little more familiar than either of the gentlemen who have addressed you.

I desire to say a few words in relation to the origin of the school at Hartford, and the relations which have existed from its commencement to the present time with Massachusetts, as well as with the other New England States. I have, myself, been connected with the institution, as a director, for the last twenty-five years. As is well known to the gentlemen of the Committee, the institution originated from the simple circumstance of a very interesting young lady, belonging to one of our most distinguished families, losing her hearing at the age of four or five years. Her case naturally excited a great deal of sympathy and attention, and the question arose whether the attempt should be made to educate her at home, or whether she should be sent abroad, to receive the benefit of instruction there. Her father, who was a man of wealth and distinguished position, consulted with several gentlemen of Boston, who were the most liberal patrons of the institution at its commencement, and it was determined that Mr. Gallaudet, who was considered as admirably adapted to the position, should be sent abroad, with a view to qualify himself to establish an institution of this kind. He went abroad, and spent a very considerable time in the various schools of Europe,—

more on the Continent than in England,—and returned with Mr. Clerc, to whom allusion has been made. An effort was then made to establish an institution, appeals were made to the benevolent citizens of New England, especially of Boston, and a fund was raised of about twelve thousand dollars. A charter was asked for from the State of Connecticut, in order that they might organize, and as the movement had originated in Hartford, as a matter of course, and almost of necessity, the school was established there. Shortly after, in 1819, this matter had so far attracted the attention of New England men, especially of the members of Congress from New England, that an application was made to Congress for a grant of land for the purpose of establishing this institution upon a firm foundation. That grant was obtained in 1819, and the organization of the school was completed, under the auspices, in part, of some Massachusetts men who were, at that time, engaged in this enterprise, and who were among the first officers of the institution, as Directors and Vice-Presidents. The first President of the institution was the then Governor of Connecticut, John Cotton Smith. Among the Vice-Presidents, were Hon. William Phillips, Hon. William Gray, Hon. Israel Thorndike, William Parsons, Esq., and Samuel Appleton, Esq., all of Boston. Among the Board of Directors, were Peter C. Brooks, Joseph Coolidge, Eliphelet Kimball, Israel Munson, Samuel Parkman, Daniel P. Parker, James Perkins, Andrew Ritchie, James Salisbury and David Sears, of Boston; and Simeon Forrester, Joseph Peabody and B. Pickman, Jr., of Salem. These gentlemen participated in the original organization of the institution as Vice-Presidents and Directors, making themselves so by subscriptions to the funds of the institution. The State of Connecticut, as such, simply gave us a charter for the establishment of the school, and from that day to this, have had no more to do with its management than the State of Massachusetts, the State of Maine, or any other State in the Union that avails itself of its advantages. It was a close corporation. The property and interests of the institution were placed in the hands of a Board of Trustees, and the grant of land, though made in terms to the Connecticut institution, was, from the very first, treated as for the benefit of the deaf-mutes of New England; and the institution was organized, and has been from that time, managed with a view to extending the benefits of the school as far as possible to all the citizens of New England. During the time I have been connected with the institution, I have never heard, in any meeting of the Board of Directors, any intimation from which it might be inferred that there were any State lines in existence, so far as this school was concerned. This fund has been administered strictly and entirely for the benefit of the deaf-mutes of New England. I have been led, myself, to view it, (perhaps my own occupation has rather led me to take that view of it,) rather

as a partnership for the purpose of conducting this business. Here were six States, which entered into this arrangement, constituting the States of New England, each of them having the same and equal rights, and the same and equal advantages; and it appears to me that the intimation which has been made so often, that there was patronage or a want of patronage on the part of one State or another, is entirely preposterous. The only difference between this and any other partnership is simply this: that if any one of the parties choose to withdraw, the funds, of course, remain in the hands of those who continue the connection. As a matter of fact, therefore, so far from Massachusetts patronizing the institution by sending her pupils there, she is only enjoying the benefit of her interest in the institution, and of the fund which is there placed. I have mentioned these names—names honored in Massachusetts—simply to show that they were not men who would have neglected or overlooked the interests of Massachusetts, in a matter of this kind; and, in point of fact, the institution has been governed and controlled, so far as the Directors are concerned, entirely with reference to the deaf-mutes of New England, without any regard to State lines, which have never been in any way considered. The location of the institution, whether convenient or inconvenient, is already fixed, so far as the buildings and property are concerned. In relation to the location, with reference to its accessibility by New England, that matter ought to be taken into account in considering this question. At the time the institution was organized, the time between Boston and Hartford was twenty hours; it is now reduced to about four and one-fourth. Pupils leaving Boston can get into the cars and be landed within five rods of the institution four times a day, without change of cars, and at an expense ordinarily of about three dollars. To very many parts of your own State, the institution is really more accessible than if situated in the city of Boston. To that fact you will give all the weight which its importance demands.

I wish just to refer to the matter of the charges for the support of your pupils there, notwithstanding I expose myself to the reply, that in considering this question, the pecuniary aspect of it is not worthy to be thought of at all. But I think I know Massachusetts well enough, it being my native State, to know that you are too practical men to throw aside an institution that is doing well, simply because you are obtaining advantages there at a lower cost than they can be obtained in any other direction. That is not the view Massachusetts is accustomed to take. We hold, and I think we have shown the fact, that such an institution certainly cannot be conducted more economically or advantageously under any other circumstances or in any other position. By arrangements made with the New England States, the first charge was \$115

per year. That price continued for ten years. The managers of the institution then found themselves in a condition, in consequence of the large receipts from the sale of the land granted by Congress, to reduce the charge from \$115 to \$100. That price remained up to 1863. For thirty years, the charge was \$100, which included the support and tuition of the pupils. It was expected that that charge would continue to be the price; nobody contemplated that there would be any necessity for raising it above that point. In 1863, however, we found that we were encroaching upon the funds of the institution, and in consultation with the executive officers of the States of New England, it was deemed advisable that the charge should be increased to \$125, in consequence of the very great increase, as we all know, in the expense of living four years ago. That was the charge from 1863 to 1865, when it was found that even that advance did not cover the additional expense of conducting the institution. I ought to say here, that this increased expense was not produced by any increase of the salaries of the officers of the institution; for the pay of the teachers, seven of whom, certainly, I think eight at that time, were men of liberal education, who had devoted their lives to this service, and were eminently adapted to its successful prosecution, was \$1,600 per year. In 1865, as I say, the institution found itself still encroaching upon its property, and at a meeting of the Board of Directors, it was proposed and finally agreed that the Principal, in connection with myself, should visit the governors of the New England States, and confer with them on this subject, to ascertain what course we had better pursue under the circumstances; whether we should continue to encroach yearly on the fund, or raise the price of the tuition. We visited the governors of all the New England States, and they said, with one accord, "You ought not to encroach on this fund; you ought to raise the price of tuition to a sum that will support you, and enable you to replace what has been withdrawn from the fund." In accordance with their advice, we advanced the charge to \$175, which has continued for the last two years. I am glad to be able to say, that we have, during the last year, been enabled to save something—I think about \$6,000 or \$7,000 to redeem lost ground.

Mr. STONE. This includes everything except clothing and school-books.

Mr. DAY. In the process of time, of course, the gentlemen living out of the State ceased, by death, to have any connection with the institution; but from the first, the principle was adopted, whether wisely or unwisely, of selecting the local board entirely from the city of Hartford. At the first election, I think there were two Directors chosen from a little distance in the State; but it was thought that the institution could be managed better, that its operations would be better understood, by

having a local board to manage it; and the State of Connecticut has entirely acquiesced in that opinion, and, as a State, has had no more connection with the institution, since 1819, than Massachusetts or any other State in the Union. It is in no sense a Connecticut institution, except that the State originally gave us a charter, which enabled us to hold property without taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you that the officers are now all Hartford men?

Mr. DAY. Yes, sir. That has been deemed, on the whole, judicious. We wanted men who would give their attention to it. And I ought to say, in this connection, (and I may do it without any accusation of a lack of modesty,) that we have endeavored to select for the officers of the institution men who, in our judgment, were the best adapted to fulfil the duties of the place, and men who were willing to give their time to it.

The CHAIRMAN. How many officers have you, in all?

Mr. DAY. Eight Vice-Presidents, and ten Directors, elected annually. For more than twenty-five years, the late respected Chief Justice Williams was President of the institution. He deceased two or three years ago, and the present President is the Hon. W. W. Ellsworth.

The CHAIRMAN. These are elected by whom?

Mr. DAY. It is a close corporation. They are elected by the Directors themselves, and the vacancies are filled by themselves.

Mr. SAWYER. I would like to ask the gentleman if it was by common consent of all parties that the management of the institution went into the hands of Hartford men; or was it by accident?

Mr. DAY. I suppose rather by accident. I have no special knowledge on the subject, but I have supposed that it was accidental; or rather, that it was from the conviction that the institution would be best managed by a local board to look after it. That has always been my impression, and I suppose that is the fact. It has been the aim of the professors of the institution, and the Directors, to maintain the very high position which this institution has had from the first. We have been enabled, by the large fund which we had, to secure a large number of educated teachers. I believe I am entirely within the truth when I state that there is no other institution for the education of deaf-mutes in the world that has to-day, or ever has had, so large a number of educated teachers; and we have been able to secure them, by the very fact that we have had this large amount of property, which is worth to-day nearly half a million of dollars. It stands upon our books at very much less than that. The real estate, including the buildings, stands at a little over \$82,000, but they could not be replaced to-day for less, certainly, than three times that. The land itself will sell for three times the amount at

which it stands upon our books. So that, in point of fact, the institution has property worth not less than \$450,000—I think, nearer \$500,000.

In relation to the propriety of Massachusetts continuing to send her pupils there, that certainly is a question upon which we do not feel called upon to express an opinion; we only desire to give you a fair knowledge of the facts connected with the institution, and of your relation to it. I may say, in this connection, that I was very much surprised when visiting, as I did, the governors of New England, to find that, with the exception of Governor Andrew, not one of them knew that they had any interest in the institution. They all sent their pupils there, and did it because they supposed we gave them a better education than they could get elsewhere, and for less money. They were not aware of the fact that this was their institution, precisely as much as it was ours.

We felt very great delicacy in coming before the Legislature on this matter; we knew that we should certainly expose ourselves to the charge, which would be freely made, and has been very often made, that we were here as supplicants for your favor, for your patronage. But the facts, as they appear to us, are very different. You have an interest in the property of that institution amounting to not less than \$200,000. If you choose to retire from it, it will be a very great benefit, in a pecuniary point of view, to the population of the States remaining, as it will enable us very considerably to reduce the charge for instruction. But we have felt that we were here defending our position; that we were here to show you, if we could, that in the intercourse which has taken place between Massachusetts and our institution for the last forty-five years and more, you have been, in our view of the matter, and so far as the administration of the fund was concerned, copartners with us in this whole thing. We have not felt that you were there for our benefit, or for the benefit of anybody, saving yourselves; and if, in your judgment, the time has come to withdraw from it, it will be equally satisfactory to us, excepting this one feeling: that we desire to retain our present number of pupils, and our present superior force of instructors. We have been enabled, as we think, to maintain a position at the head of American institutions, and, in our humble opinion, of the institutions of the world. We do not believe that there is any institution in the world where so good and so perfect an education is obtained by deaf-mutes as at the institution at Hartford. We have no idea that wisdom is going to die with us; but the circumstances by which we have been surrounded have enabled us to do for the pupils what no other institution has been able to do. That is the view we have taken of it, and we are entirely unwilling that you should withdraw from us under any false impressions upon this matter; for we think that the

facts will clearly prove that the institution is as much yours as ours, that it is an institution worthy of your patronage, and induce you to continue your connection with it.

I desire to say, in this connection, that if it is the pleasure of Massachusetts, or any other State, to be represented in the Board of Directors, nothing would afford us so much pleasure. We have not taken the ground that this institution must be conducted in a particular way, but we have desired to make it all it could be made. When Mr. Mann and Dr. Howe returned from Europe in 1843, and reported that in the German institutions everybody was taught to articulate, the first thing the Board of Directors did was to send Mr. Weld (a man every way qualified for the investigation,) abroad, to visit the institutions of Europe, not to establish the fact that we were better than anybody else, but to see what they had in those institutions that it was desirable for us to copy. He visited between thirty and forty of those institutions, and devoted all the time necessary for the purpose; and in looking over his report, I have been struck by this fact, that no point has been indicated by any witness before you, upon which he does not report very fully. The system of day schools—the system of articulation—the question of uniting the deaf, dumb and blind—on all these points he reports fully. There is nothing new in this whole matter; there are no new revelations; there is not one point that is not dwelt upon very much at length in Mr. Weld's report. At the same time, in consequence of the reports that were made by Dr. Howe and Mr. Mann, Rev. George E. Day was sent abroad by the New York institution, which was the largest in the country at that time. The investigations of these gentlemen were conducted independently of each other, they spent months in examining this question, and returned with the very full conviction upon the minds of both of them, that we were substantially on the right track. And I may say, in relation to Mr. Day, (who, I think, was born in West Springfield,) that I know of no man more fully adapted to the purpose for which he went abroad than he is. He cannot go through a country without learning more of it than many of us would by dwelling in it a very long time. He is a man of remarkable powers of observation, and capable of obtaining information as he goes along. These gentlemen returned and reported, both of them, that in their judgment we were substantially upon the right basis, and that no institutions in Europe afforded so good results in the manner of teaching.

In 1858, Mr. Day had occasion to go abroad again, upon other business, and the institution with which he had been so long connected requested him, as has been indicated to you, to go over the same ground. He did so, and the results of his observations were read to you by Mr. Stone the other day. The investigations he has been able to make

abroad,—and I think he has had better opportunities than any other American to make investigations in these matters,—have confirmed him more and more in the opinion that the system of instruction adopted in this country is the correct one.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of the interest Massachusetts has in the institution. What interest has she, except that she has the right to send pupils there at a less rate than would be required if it were not for that fund? What control has she?

Mr. DAY. She has not exercised any control, neither has Connecticut. The view taken by the Directors has been this: that this was a fund set apart for New England, to be used for this special purpose; that they did not know whether a man lived north or south of Massachusetts; that every deaf and dumb person in Massachusetts had a direct interest in the school, because he has the benefit of this fund in his instruction.

The CHAIRMAN. You said you would be glad if Massachusetts could be represented there. How would you have that wish expressed? You must realize, of course, that Massachusetts and every other New England State would naturally have an interest in that institution. Would not the suggestion come with greater propriety from the close corporation, than for a party outside, to appeal for the right to come into it?

Mr. DAY. That is a very proper suggestion, and it is entitled to very great consideration. That matter has not been considered, but the general fact has been often alluded to, that we should be very glad if the other New England States would take a deeper interest in the institution than they do, and give more time and attention to it.

The CHAIRMAN. When you were speaking of the ignorance of the governors of the New England States in regard to the institution, it occurred to me that a suggestion that the governors of the several New England States be *ex officio* members of the Board, might be acceptable. It would instruct them, at least.

Mr. DAY. I feel authorized to say, that any suggestion of that kind would be received by the Directors, and would be at once gladly complied with.

Mr. BRANNING. Do the officers receive any compensation?

Mr. DAY. The Treasurer, who has charge of this large fund, and the charge of investments, receives \$200 a year. I ought to say, that of the Board of Directors, three are elected yearly as a Directing Committee, whose special duty it is to examine, at very frequent intervals, into the affairs of the institution; and if the Principal has any point upon which he wishes to consult, he goes to these men, and it is their duty to go to him, and examine fully and minutely into all the affairs of the institution. The chairman of that committee receives

\$100. I ought to say, that this Directing Committee have the special oversight of the monthly disbursements of the institution, and advise on all these points.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of the property of the institution. Is that property in money or in land?

Mr. DAY. We have the fund of the institution, amounting to something over \$200,000. We have a small farm outside, connected with the institution, where we keep our cows; but it is really used for the benefit of the institution.

The CHAIRMAN. And your investments are not in real estate?

Mr. DAY. No, sir. We have thirteen acres, situated in as desirable and valuable part of the city as we have for the best residences, on the highest ground in the city. The location of the institution could not have been more admirably selected; and of course, at that time, the property was bought for a comparatively trifling amount—not one-third, not one-fourth, I think, what it would bring to-day.

Mr. STONE. \$8,000, I think, was the price paid for the land.

Mr. DAY. The land itself would bring to-day certainly more than \$200,000.

Adjourned to Thursday morning, at 9½ o'clock.

FIFTH HEARING.

THURSDAY, February 7.

The Committee met at 9½ o'clock, and Mr. DAY continued his address as follows :—

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—At the time of the adjournment yesterday, I had not quite concluded what I desire to say on this subject; but I shall occupy very little more of your time.

We have felt in this examination from the first, that we were in a position of very decided embarrassment in presenting the case, because we find great difficulty in ascertaining precisely the views of the affirmative on this question; and the more so, because, so far as appears to us at the present time, there has really been no new matter introduced. All these points were included in the report of the Board of State Charities last year, and substantially all these points have been before the gentlemen who have had this matter in charge at Hartford for the last twenty-five years. No new points have been suggested. Occasionally, a new actor is introduced upon the scene, as was the case the other day, when Mr. Whipple appeared for the first time,—and I am inclined to think for the last. Mr. Carlin, also, has been brought from New York to testify on this subject, and before I conclude, I wish to make some allusion to the statements which he made before this Committee. We had supposed that the gentlemen would bring definitely before this Committee some views that they desire to see carried out; that they would mature some plan which we should be enabled to show to be impracticable, or be ourselves convinced of the correctness of their position. We should be most happy to receive any new light which can be brought upon this subject and to conform to it. We do not control our institution upon the principle of the laws of the Medes and Persians, that no changes are to be made. Our object has been from the first to ascertain what was the best mode of instruction and the best principle upon which to conduct the institution, and that mode, that principle, we have ever been ready to carry out. We have been most industrious in our efforts to ascertain precisely what is the best mode of instruction, and our conviction is that we are on the right track.

The Committee cannot have failed to notice how very careful the gentlemen who have this matter in charge have been not to commit themselves to any particular mode of conducting the institution, or any particular mode of instruction. We are, therefore, greatly embarrassed

to know how to meet the question. Their course has reminded me a little of an anecdote I saw in one of the daily papers lately, which seems to me to be a case quite in point. I noticed that in the Kentucky legislature a resolve was introduced, "that the capitol of the State be, and the same is, hereby removed from Frankfort to some other place hereafter to be designated." The capitol, I suppose, was to go on wheels until they had, according to the Kentucky fashion, raffled for the position in which they should locate it. At any rate, this seems to be very clear. That a larger vote could be obtained to remove the capitol from Frankfort than to determine where it should be carried to; it seems to me that this movement has been conducted very much upon that principle.

In relation to the testimony of Mr. Carlin, let me say, that he is not unknown to us. He is a most intelligent man, who has arrived certainly at years of maturity, and is entitled to very great credit for the frankness with which he has stated his views, though they seem not to be very distinct on the question. In relation to the question of articulation, he says he has examined the subject, and is not decided in his own mind whether that is the proper mode of instruction or not. But one point he is very decided upon, which you must have noticed, that, in order to have the deaf and dumb well instructed, you must discard all your present institutions and all your present instructors. He takes that ground most distinctly. That you can never have your deaf and dumb well instructed, until the present institutions and the present instructors are dispensed with. He seems really to have received some new light upon that subject,—whether before or since he reached Boston I am unable to say; for it is a fact, that, within a few months, this same Mr. Carlin was an applicant for the position of assistant-teacher in the American Institution at Hartford; showing that at that time he did not so entirely condemn the mode of instruction which is carried on there, or that he expected by that means to create a revolution in the institution.

MR. DUDLEY. How long ago was that?

MR. DAY. Within the last year or two. What particular motive he had, whether it was to revolutionize the mode of instruction, or the more substantial question of bread and butter, I will not undertake to decide; and in relation to his theories, I have very little to say. That is a matter which the gentlemen of the Committee will be quite well able to determine. Of one thing I am quite certain. It is not in accordance with the usual method of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to employ a man to do a thing well who does not know anything about it; and when you adopt that principle in the ordinary every-day duties of life, I shall expect you will be influenced by a consideration of

that kind. When, if you want a lawyer, you employ a tailor, or, if you want a mason, you go to a blacksmith, I shall think arguments of this kind will have some weight, but not before. I wish to call attention particularly to one point which he makes. He introduces in his communication one scene which cannot fail to have struck you with surprise and with pain. He says if you go into the chapel, you will find ten in the whole number of pupils, 225, who are paying some attention to the services; the rest are engaged in playing and frolicking, entirely uninterested in the service which is going on before them. Now, I take it upon myself to say, that a more perfect caricature was never introduced anywhere; and if we have the pleasure of seeing you there, as we hope we shall before many days, I take upon myself to say, that there is no one thing which will strike you with more surprise and admiration than the chapel services connected with the institution. I am myself often in the chapel, and I never go without feeling that of all the audiences I have ever seen anywhere, under any circumstances, I have never seen one so attentive; and it is the universal remark of persons visiting the institution for the first time, that no other audience that they have ever seen have paid so strict and eager attention to what is taking place. This point I confess has been somewhat unpleasant to me. This stuff, immediately after coming into your possession, has been sent to the newspapers in different parts of the State, to be scattered broadcast among the people. It is a slander, I say, upon the institution and the gentlemen connected with it. I do not think myself that it is a fair way to meet a question of this kind. If the gentleman were at all familiar with the services there, he would know that it was entirely an unfair statement of the case. Whether he has ever been in our chapel or not, I do not know. Certainly, it is most charitable to believe that he has never been there; and it is the opinion of the gentlemen associated with me that he was never in our chapel in the world at an ordinary religious service. Yet he goes on and describes minutely, and with thrilling effect, scenes represented as there transpiring, which he must have known, if he had ever attended service there, were most ridiculous caricatures.

Mr. STONE. A word of explanation. Mr. Carlin refers to services two hours long. We have no such services. Our services are scarcely an hour long, and these only on the Sabbath. He evidently refers to the religious services. We have a religious service, occupying a little less than an hour, morning and afternoon, and I am not aware that he has ever been present at that service; certainly not for many years. My impression is, that he has not been in the institution for forty years when he has witnessed a service of that kind.

Mr. DAY. As I have said, so far as I have been able to see, there have been no new facts brought before the Committee during this inves-

tigation to prove that our mode of instruction has failed of accomplishing its purpose. The strong point which has been urged here, is one which has been agitated to some extent for the last twenty-five years. That is, the question whether your deaf-mutes should be educated in a Connecticut institution. I have tried to show you that if this institution has any decided characteristics, it is as a Massachusetts institution. You have more than twice the interest in it that we have; you are receiving more than twice the benefit from it that we are, as a State; and in our view of the case, and in our administration of the affairs of the institution, it is, in no sense, a Connecticut institution any more than it is a Massachusetts, a Maine, a Vermont or New Hampshire institution.

Allusion has been made to the opportunities which you have had, through your legislative committees, your governors, and your councillors, to examine the institution. I do not propose to dwell upon it. Certainly, I do not appear here as the advocate of those gentlemen. From the opportunities I have had of seeing them, I think they have been abundantly able to protect their own interests in this matter; but whether they have not, I do not propose to appear as their advocate. The fact is, that it was the custom of Governor Andrew to visit the institution quite frequently, and also of Governor Banks. Governor Andrew was especially thorough in his examination of the institution to ascertain whether the scholars really knew anything, and I have been much pleased with the ingenuity he manifested in testing these children. Your present honorable governor has been but a short time in office and I think we have had the pleasure of seeing him there but once; but in years past, the institution has been frequently visited by gentlemen of your State who, we supposed, had a pretty thorough knowledge of what was being done there. At any rate, we have given them every means of knowing precisely what we were doing; and though the committees who have visited us have not been able to view the matter in the light which gentlemen who have this matter in charge seem to view it, it has appeared to me that they really did understand the merits and position of the case exceedingly well.

We have, for a number of years past, sent the blind of our State to the Perkins Institution in Boston. We have done so because we believed that they could be better educated there and at less expense to us than at home. It may be said, and probably will be said, that we have a small number there. The present number is twelve; but the governor informed me only a few days ago, that every applicant had been sent here since this arrangement had been made, and if the number were threefold what it was, they would all be sent here. We have never supposed for a moment that we were encroaching upon our self-respect or upon our State dignity in sending our blind pupils here.

I will not, gentlemen, occupy your time longer. I desire to express for my associates here and for the Directors, our thanks for the courtesy with which this Committee have listened to what we have had to say. We hoped and expected, when we came here the first time, that the gentlemen would be prepared to present their case, and if we had anything to say in reply, we should say it and go home. We have not intended to annoy you or to place ourselves in the position of persons pressing a claim. We desired only that you should understand the relation in which you stood to the institution. We desired especially that the charges which have been so freely made against the general management of the institution, so far as its mode of education is concerned, should be shown to be entirely erroneous; and we felt that it was due to you, after the long intercourse which we have had with this State, and especially that it was due to ourselves, that the truth in this case should be known; and we leave the matter entirely in your hands, without the least feeling of anxiety in regard to the result. If you, in your wisdom, decide that it is better for Massachusetts that her pupils should be educated within the borders of your own State, it will be perfectly satisfactory to us. In a pecuniary point of view, I think you will see that it will be a decided advantage to the States which remain. If you withdraw from this institution, you will leave a large amount of money, which is annually employed for the support of your pupils, which can be devoted to the pupils of other States. We believe—and we are entirely conscientious in that belief—that with the organization we have, that with the efficient corps of teachers we employ, and with the long experience we have had, your children receive a better education at Hartford than they would receive in your own State. We have no doubt upon that subject at all; but that is a point entirely for you to decide, and we do not wish to press it at all.

Hon. H. A. STEVENS of Boston, then addressed the Committee. He said:—

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee,—It is with no small degree of embarrassment that I stand in the position that I do at the present time. It is proper for me to state, however, that I do so voluntarily. The question may, perhaps, be asked why I should be more interested in this subject than any other gentleman in the State. That question, of course, I cannot answer; I can only leave it for every gentleman to answer for himself. If other gentlemen, who may be more or less interested in the education of the children of this State, are not interested in this subject, it may or may not be from a want of interest to themselves. But, sir, knowing something of the his-

tory of the education of this class of children in our State for the past six or eight years, being somewhat conversant with it, and listening as I did with such utter surprise to the remarks of His Excellency on the subject, which led me to inquire if something of a remarkable nature had not taken place within the last two or three years, and perhaps even more recently, I felt a desire to attend the meetings of the Committee, whenever this subject should be investigated. Finding, therefore, upon the appointment of the Committee, that most of the gentlemen were personally known to me, and some of them intimately, I took the liberty to attend the meetings, and have been interested in the subject from that time until the present. My interest has deepened during this discussion, from the fact that my previous convictions in relation to the matter have been very materially strengthened. It seems to me that, if there was any ground (and I can readily conceive, myself, what the ground was,) upon which His Excellency said what he did in his message, if the reasons had been set forth before him, upon the one side and the other, as they have been before this intelligent Committee, certainly the subject never would have been brought to the attention of this Legislature. It seemed to me, sir, that the gentlemen from Hartford appeared here under some disadvantage, and that, however well they might state their case, there were some points upon which they might not feel at liberty to speak. It is on that account that I appear here, although what few words I have to say may be entirely wasted, for it is hardly to be supposed that in the progress of this investigation, any of these points can fail to receive the attention of the Committee.

It may be proper for me to state, sir, as persons may inquire, why I am interested in this subject, that I have been in the Legislature, in one branch or the other, ever since 1861. In the year 1862, I was appointed upon the Committee on Public Charitable Institutions by the then Speaker of the House, who is now His Excellency the Governor and I have been upon that committee in one form or another until the present time. Last year I declined to serve upon the Committee on Public Charitable Institutions, and served upon the Committee on Prisons instead; and I was chairman of a special committee raised for the purpose of investigating the subject of the reduction of the cost of our State charities; so that virtually I was upon the Committee on Public Charitable Institutions, for the duties of these were substantially the same.

This case, in my judgment, has been presented in a somewhat singular manner. For instance, the attack which was made by Dr. Howe upon the intelligence of the legislative committees. He stated, as I am informed, that they had been selected with no regard to their intelligence or fitness for the place. I have nothing to say in relation to

myself; I have only to refer the committee to some of the gentlemen who have been appointed on that committee. One of the first gentlemen with whom I was associated was Dr. Hooker, of Cambridge, the father of one of the gentlemen on this Committee; and there were several other eminent gentlemen of this State upon the committee. I think, setting the present committee aside, that that committee would compare favorably with any other committee appointed for the last six years, upon the subject for which they were selected.

It seems to me that there have been but two questions raised on this subject, as it has been presented. One is, the removal of this class of persons from the present institution, (and I think the Committee cannot fail to see that the present institution is a New England institution, and belongs as much to Massachusetts as to any other State;) and the other question which has been raised here incidentally, and as some say, unintentionally, is in regard to the mode of instruction. When the matter was opened, at the first hearing, you will remember Dr. Howe stated that the reasons for the removal of the pupils at Hartford to this State were presented in the Second Annual Report of the Board of State Charities. Well, sir, I am somewhat conversant with the history of the formation of the Board of State Charities. I remember that a very intelligent gentleman of Boston, who was always very ardent in whatever he undertook, in one Legislature, (I think in 1862,) was exceedingly interested in relation to the charities of the State; so much so, that a special committee was formed, of which he was a member, in relation to the creation of some sort of board, who would take charge of the entire thing. You will pardon me for this apparent diversion, because I feel that possibly it may not be really a diversion from the subject, to refer somewhat to the formation of the Board of State Charities. This subject was gone into at considerable length at that time, and finally it was passed over until the next Legislature. The next year a similar committee was formed, of which I had the honor to be a member, and which resulted in the framing of the bill which is chapter 240 of the Acts of 1863, forming the Board of State Charities; and I thought I knew then, and think I know now, from the discussions which took place in the committee, what was the intention in the formation of that board. I recollect very well the prediction that was made at the time, that the board might be a source of great good, and might be a source of great evil to the Commonwealth. That board has been in existence only a little upwards of two years, and it would not be proper for me to say what the result has been, one way or the other; neither should I be prepared to say. But, sir, whatever may be said for or against them, and whatever statements may be made in relation to the amount of money they save, and all that sort of thing, I suppose it is

an incontestible fact, that the only money that is saved in these matters of legislation, so far as that is concerned, is saved solely and entirely by the agent of the Board of State Charities, who was as efficient before as after the formation of that board.

After the statement made by Dr. Howe, that the reasons for this removal were set forth in that report, it occurred to me that I must certainly have forgotten the fact. I went home that evening, took the report, and examined it somewhat carefully and thoroughly; and I found that the impressions which I formed last winter, in connection with my associates, in relation to the manner in which this subject was treated by the Board of State Charities, were correct. Inasmuch as this matter has been referred to, it seems to me proper to call attention to it at this time. You will bear in mind that if this is a controversy between the Hartford institution and the Board of State Charities, the controversy is not confined to these parties. You will find, by referring to the report of the Columbia College, written by Dr. Gallaudet, that the subject is discussed very minutely, with reference to this very report which I hold in my hands. I hope, before I get through, to make some more special reference to the facts which that report of Dr. Gallaudet sets forth.

I desire now to read a paragraph from the Report of the Board of State Charities for 1866. Following the portion devoted to the almshouses of the State, they have this heading, "*Special Classes. Deaf-Mutes—The Blind;*" and they say:—

"The evil effects of congregating together vicious and criminal persons will be touched upon in speaking of the reformation of juveniles; though very briefly, because there has been a great deal written and spoken upon the subject, and it is generally understood that some sort of separation from vicious associates must be the basis of all attempts at reform."

Now, sir, I take this ground: I have no desire to use strong language, but I do say, that with the intelligent gentlemen whom we have had before us at all these hearings, who are mutes, the word "insult" is certainly the mildest word that can be used to characterize a comparison of these persons with the criminals of this State. Either the gentleman who writes this paragraph does not know the power of language, (and that we cannot impute to him,) or it is an insult to this class of individuals to use this language in that connection. You will notice that the entire effort in this report is to bring down this class of unfortunate persons to a level with the criminals and paupers of the State. And why? Because, immediately preceding the portion relating to them is a description of the almshouses and their inmates, and immediately after it is a description of the correctional institutions of the State. Why is this class of persons mentioned here at all? They are no more the

"wards of the State," as they have been called, than the children of our Normal schools—not at all. The argument has been carried on upon the other side on the supposition that these children are wards of the Commonwealth, and that nobody has anything to do with them after they are admitted to this school. That is all a fallacy, the whole of it. What has the State to do with it? This is an educational matter, entirely. The Hartford institution is a school for the education of these children. The State, as a State, has no control over them. To be sure, admission to the school is secured by the action of the Governor and Council; but after the children are admitted to the school, they are as much under the control of their parents as if they were in the Normal schools of the State. Nobody has any control over them except their instructors and their parents. The relation between the children and their parents is the same as before. I say it is wrong, decidedly wrong, for anybody, under the name of the Board of State Charities, or anything else, to class these persons with the poor and indigent people of the State. How was it years ago, when some of the States, (I am not sure whether Massachusetts ever did it or not,) required, that if a person had a child who was deaf and dumb, he should set forth that he was unable to educate his child, and get a certain number of his neighbors to certify to the fact, before the State would pay for the education of that child? What was the result? The man said, "I pay my tax to educate your children; if you will not educate my child, let him grow up in ignorance; I am not going round to get my neighbors to sign a certificate that I am a poor man and unable to educate my child."

Here is another thing. You will notice that last year they recommended certain specific things to be done in order to educate them. This year, they recommend that you shall stop their going to Hartford, and then provide some other way to educate them. There is nothing definite through the whole of it. Yet they state, on page 59,—

"The society to provide a suitable building for school-house, and, if necessary, a workshop, and to employ competent teachers.

"The commissioners to designate the children who are to be sent to the school as beneficiaries of Massachusetts, as is now done by the governor and council; and to allow the society for each beneficiary a sum not greater than that now paid for beneficiaries at the Hartford school.

"The society to instruct and train these beneficiaries gratuitously in its school. To board the children of parents who do not live in the neighborhood of the school, in respectable families, and pay —— dollars and —— cents a week, for at least forty weeks in a year. They shall, however, if possible, place but one mute in any one family, and never more than three.

"The commissioners should have power to require the parents of beneficiaries to pay a certain part, say one-third or quarter of the cost of the board of their children; and when they are manifestly unable to do so, then to require the

towns where they have a settlement to pay a sum not exceeding one dollar in a week, for forty weeks in a year."

Now, gentlemen, I used to live in the country; I know something of the town meeting; and although it is not always, perhaps, a very refined institution, yet, I believe it is an institution which may be conducive to some good. But where will you find a man in the country, a farmer, perhaps, who is well to do, who will send his child anywhere to be educated, and then have it brought into the town's report, "\$40 a year for educating Mr. ——'s child." How does that sound? Is there any gentleman in this Legislature who would do that? No, sir; not by any means. I know something what the feeling would be in such a case. That is one of the ways in which this subject is treated in this report.

Then there are one or two other things equally ridiculous here. After speaking of this subject, they say,—

"Three commissioners might be appointed by the governor and council, without pay, to be called 'Commissioners for the Education of Deaf-Mutes.' Said commissioners may contract with any responsible society or organization of citizens of Massachusetts, who will undertake to instruct and train indigent deaf-mutes belonging to the State," and so on.

They say there are several advantages here:—

"1st. The care and oversight of these wards of the Commonwealth would fall where they really belong—upon our own citizens,—a very large number of whom would come into constant relations with them.

"2d. The children would be taught within the State, and nearer to their homes; and a large proportion of them might live at home."

Now look at it, gentlemen. We have, perhaps one hundred and twenty-five children in the Hartford school. I do not know the exact number, but that is near enough. Where do these children come from? They come from seventy different towns in this State. And yet this report says, that the greater part of them can board at home! You see the idea is perfectly ridiculous, from beginning to end.

Then they recommend in this report that they shall be placed out to board in families, one or two in a family, and never to exceed three. It has been already shown to you, I think, gentlemen, that this is not a practicable thing. You could not find, in my judgment, a teacher, who is in the habit of teaching deaf-mutes, who would undertake the care of an institution of this kind, provided you were to board these children out in families, even if they were all in one place. I think that is neither practicable nor possible. These children need special care. I think Prof. Bartlett, who has long been an advocate of the earlier edu-

cation of deaf-mutes, would say that, even if he should attempt this, he would not attempt it, unless the children could be brought together,—unless they could be in an institution by themselves. That is to say, I think he would not attempt to educate younger children than those now sent to Hartford, unless they were brought into an institution by themselves, where he could have the care and oversight of them; and I think that is certainly good reasoning.

Very much might be said, it seems to me, to show that this report is impracticable. In fact, I talked with several members of the committee last year, and they considered this report an entirely impracticable thing, from beginning to end.

Now, the question arises, Who come here to advocate the removal of the deaf-mutes? Dr. Howe tells us that the reasons for it are set forth in this report. He tells us that he differs from the other gentlemen on the Board of State Charities, and, consequently, the Board of State Charities do not come here asking for this removal. Mr. Sanborn states that his views do not correspond with those of his associates—meaning, I suppose, the persons upon the Board of State Charities. So that it comes to this, that the Board of State Charities do not come here advocating this removal. If they are in favor of it, why have they not been here? Dr. Allen, of Lowell; Mr. Earle, of Worcester; Mr. Blaisdell, of Fall River,—all these intelligent gentlemen constituting the Board of State Charities,—why have they not been here? Not one of them has appeared before this Committee, to my knowledge; and I take it for granted, from what Dr. Howe and Mr. Sanborn have said, that the Board of State Charities do not advocate this removal. I suppose that is a well-settled fact. Who does advocate it? So far as I have been able to learn, and so far as the case has been presented, its advocates are Dr. Howe, Mr. Sanborn, Mr. Hubbard and Mr. Talbot. These are the only persons whom I have heard upon the subject. It seems, from statements that have been made here, that Dr. Howe has been opposed to this institution for thirty years; and these Hartford gentlemen tell you,—and I suppose the fact is undeniable,—that no new reasons have been presented, but it is simply the same thing over again, which has been presented for a great number of years, with the addition of now and then a new disciple. It can easily be seen why Mr. Talbot should be interested in this matter. Miss Rogers, who is ardent on this subject of articulation, is a relative of his and a member of his own family, and it would be very strange if, in Mr. Talbot's peculiar situation, he should not be willing to render her all the assistance he could. That is all very natural.

Mr. Sanborn, perhaps, will not deny the fact, that under the definition of his duties, he cannot visit the Hartford school from time to time in

any official capacity, whether he claims to have done so or not. Of course, that is not material in this case. I simply wish to show that the Board of State Charities, as a Board, do not advocate this removal, and that whatever has been done, has been done by individuals. I know of my personal knowledge, that whenever individuals from Massachusetts go to Hartford, they are treated with the utmost politeness; and there has been no testimony to the contrary, except that Dr. Howe says that when he goes there, he does not feel at home. Well, perhaps that will not be considered strange. If I had advocated a thing for twenty-five years, and had not succeeded, and went in among those men who had always beaten me, I think I should not feel quite so much at home as I should among those with whom I had had better success. That is not strange; I do not know that it is to be wondered at. But Dr. Howe is the only individual, man or woman, of whom I ever heard, who went to that institution, and did not find himself at home very soon. I was struck with the remark of a gentleman last winter—a very intelligent member of the Committee—while the military company of which Master Green was captain, was performing. I ought to say here, although I am not a military man, that the best performance in a military way I ever saw, was the performance of that company. I wish you could have seen it. This gentleman, to whom I have referred, said to me, "My dear sir, why didn't you tell me of this before I came here?" "Well, sir," I said, "I am not in the habit of telling; I thought it was better for you to come and see for yourself." I think it will be the universal expression of the Committee, when they go there, that the proficiency which is made by these pupils in their studies, and whatever they engage in, is entirely beyond their expectations. Perhaps the reason why so few persons take an interest in this subject is, because so few avail themselves of the opportunities to visit the institution, or would visit it whether in the Commonwealth or not.

Now, sir, there have been something over five hundred children educated in this school, and I think it somewhat singular and significant that no parent has been brought here to advocate this removal—not a single individual. When you take into consideration the fact, that the Board of State Charities, who pretend to have written this report, do not appear here, as a Board, and that no single individual appears here to advocate this removal, it seems to me you must come to the conclusion that there is no general desire on the part of those interested in this matter for a change. It ought, in fairness, to be stated, that the Association of Deaf-Mutes in this city do advocate this measure. Well, why? Mr. Smith,—who is a personal friend and near neighbor of mine, and on whose account I regret exceedingly to take any part in this discussion, and yet I do not fear any break in our friendship for that reason,

—Mr. Smith states that his articulation was neglected for the first three years. I believe that is the only thing which he brings against the Hartford institution. But it is very natural that the deaf-mutes in this city should wish for this change; it shows their intelligence. If there is to be any change in the Hartford school, if the pupils are to be removed, and a school established in Boston, of course it will help them. They have an association here of fifty or more; they have quite a large congregation on the Sabbath, and are in a flourishing condition. If a school can be established for the education of these children within the limits of Boston, or somewhere near here, it will of course help them, and they would be very glad to have it done. But they give no special reason for it; they make no complaint of Hartford; they simply say they are in favor of it; and it is very natural they should be.

Mr. Turner hands to me the report of Mr. Weld in relation to Mr. Smith, in 1846. I have never seen it before, but I will read it:—

“Amos Smith was made perfectly deaf by scarlet fever at about seven years of age, and was admitted to the asylum at nine. He retained on admission the ability to utter most of the words in the child's vocabulary, to ask and answer questions intelligibly on all common subjects, and to repeat some of the little hymns of the nursery, and a few passages of the Scriptures. But he was fast losing his recollection of the proper pronunciation of words, and even of some of the letters of the alphabet. He was making no intellectual progress, and his knowledge of written language was not sufficient to enable him, by reading, or unassisted study, to ascertain the meaning of more complicated or more elevated expressions of thought, than such as a child of seven years would generally understand. He could read very little upon the lips; not at all except the most familiar words, phrases, and proper names.

“In this case, there are more obstacles to overcome than in the preceding [Chamberlain's]; but the result has been altogether encouraging in most respects, and the reverse in none. During the five years he has been with us, he has acquired a respectable common education. His speech has been gradually improving, especially for the year past, while his instruction has been more thorough and systematic, until it is now unusually clear and pleasant for a deaf person. He can read from the Bible or any common book so as to be understood by a circle of friends, though many of his words are not perfectly pronounced, and the tones of his voice are monotonous. In reading upon the lips, he is making constant improvement, but finds, in this exercise, his greatest difficulty. It is, probably, however, not insurmountable; especially if increased quickness of sight should result from daily practice. This we hope will be the case, though, as his sight is naturally weak, we may be disappointed.”

There is, in the same office with Mr. Smith, a deaf-mute—Mr. Holmes. He was born deaf, and never articulated; but, according to the advantages which he has had, and the time he has been in the office, he is as efficient, so far as I know or have learned, as Mr. Smith; and when he has been there as long, he will probably be quite as efficient, as

Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has a little the advantage, inasmuch as he can articulate, and is able to administer the oath to persons making acknowledgments of deeds, which Mr. Holmes, of course, can never do.

Now, gentlemen, the only reasons which I have heard for this change—and I have endeavored to listen with care—are the reasons which I have stated as having been presented by these gentlemen; and we can all of us judge of their motives. You will bear in mind that not a single individual who has ever had any experience with their own children in this institution comes here to find any fault whatever, or advise that these children shall no longer be sent there.

By the way, one of the reasons which Mr. Sanborn mentions is, that if the children were educated within our own State—I think that is the strong point he makes—they could be taught at a much younger age. Now, sir, I take this ground—and I think it will be substantiated by those best acquainted with the subject—that, unfortunate as these children are, it would be difficult to induce fathers and mothers to allow them to go away from home under eight years of age; and sometimes it is with reluctance that they allow it even then. But if they are to be educated before that age, they must be brought into an institution by themselves, and I doubt very much whether any considerable number would be placed in such an institution, if it were established in this State; for parents prefer to have their children under their own care, and to give them what instruction they can, until they become firm in their bodily health. Persons who have deaf and dumb children naturally inquire what is the best place to send them to, and they learn from parents who have had children at Hartford whether it is a good place to send them to or not.

Another point which has been raised here is, that this institution happens to be out of the State. It is fourteen or fifteen miles over the line; but it is within twenty miles of one of the most flourishing cities in this State. I have heard, by-the-by, that there is a large amount of money to be donated to the Commonwealth, if a school shall be established in this State; but if we are to be guided by this report of the Board of State Charities, we shall have several schools. You will find, gentlemen, if you investigate this thing closely, that it sometimes comes up in one form and sometimes in another. Sometimes it comes up in the form of an institution where you can have the children all together, and then it comes up in the form of several schools, with the children scattered all round. It is very difficult to know how they would have it. But suppose we take the donation of the gentleman at Northampton, who says he will give \$50,000. I suppose the institution, in that case, would be located there; and it is one of the best places in the State. How much better off will the deaf and dumb association then

be than it is now? Where would you find a person who would send his child there any more readily than to Hartford? That is a mere supposition. It is not so. There is not a gentleman here before this Committee who would have any preference, provided the institutions were alike. You see, gentlemen, that these different theories—that you can establish several schools, and let the children board round, one, two or three in a place; that you can put them in different workshops; that you can establish an institution, and let them board at home—you see that these theories do not come together; you find, gentlemen, that you cannot hitch them together.

One other allusion has been made here, which struck me as very remarkable at the time. While there has been an attempt on the part of the Board of State Charities to keep these persons down in the class of paupers, you remember that Dr. Howe referred to the criminals of Rome. He said they had an institution there, where, instead of shutting up boys in jail all day, they sent them to various workshops round the city, and had them return at night to the prison. He would have us manage our deaf-mutes in that way. Is that the way we do with our children? We put our children at five years of age into the common schools; they go there until they are fourteen or fifteen, as the case may be, and then the boys go and learn their trades. Do you send a boy to school an hour a day, and let him spend the rest of the time in learning a trade? No, you educate him, and then let him go and learn a trade. Boys learn their trades now in two or three years; it used to take seven years. Why should we not do the same thing with the mute? He goes to school at eight and comes out at fourteen, and if he has not learned a trade, he has nevertheless learned the use of tools, which he can make useful in learning a trade; and he has received an education; and that is the great thing. We do not send our other boys into workshops to learn trades and then take them out and give them an education; why should we do so with this class of children? To show, in another form, that these persons should not be treated any differently from others, and to show, too, that they are not paupers, I think it was stated by Mr. Hubbard, speaking in reference to his own child, that he intended next year to send his little girl to the common school. If a person has a child who is a mute, he has a right, nominally speaking, to send that child to the public school; but, I say, he has no right to expect him to be educated at the public school, because, if educated there, it must be at the expense of the rest of the scholars; and consequently the State says to that individual, "We have a school provided especially for your child, and if you choose to send him there, we will pay the tuition." That being done, you see that the parent has precisely the same charge over his child that he would have if the child

were placed in the common school. He is not a "ward of the State," by any means.

It seems to me that, after all, the only plan which has been presented is this. After having argued here several days, mainly upon the subject of articulation,—whether it shall or shall not be taught,—Dr. Howe states that he does not desire any particular mode of instruction to be set forth, but merely desires that the Legislature shall pass an Act withdrawing from the Governor and Council the authority to send these children to Hartford. That is all they ask. Now, gentlemen, if you can conceive of any greater calamity than that, so far as it extends, I would like to know what it is. It ought to be stated here, that the number of mutes is not increasing in the State materially, if at all. The school at Hartford is amply sufficient, in all its arrangements, to accommodate all the persons who apply for instruction from the New England States. It always has been so, and no difficulty has been experienced by the children of this State, as I am informed by the proper authorities; and I have made special inquiry. That being the case, whenever the time comes for the admission of new pupils into the school this year, we are simply to say to the parents of these children—twenty, perhaps—"We propose to send no more children to Hartford." "What is to be done?" "Well, we will make the best provision we can for you. Here is a school, long established, against which nothing can be said, abundantly equipped in every particular, that has been perfectly satisfactory in the education of our children for the past fifty years, that is ready to take them at the present time,—it is our own institution,—the buildings happen to be in the State of Connecticut, but in every other respect it is our own institution; but the wisdom of the Legislature thought we ought not to send any more children there. We will do the best we can for your children. We are without school-houses and without teachers, but Massachusetts, in her progress, is going to start the thing some way. We will take your children—there are sixteen or twenty of them—and if they were sent to Hartford they would be distributed, according to their mental capacities, in four or five classes, but in this school we have got to put them into two classes and distribute them round among different families to board." This looks to me the most like a farce of anything I have seen for a long time. You will pardon the bluntness of the language, for I am not accustomed to speaking; but I cannot look at it in any other light. When a school is in successful operation, against which nothing can be said, (nothing, so far as I have heard, ever has been said against it,) to undertake to fix up some sort of a school here in Massachusetts, by which we shall educate these children, would be an injury, of course, to the cause of education and a public calamity. If you got your child into Hartford last year and mine hap-

pened to be a year younger, and had to go through this experiment to get an education, I think every gentleman would look upon it as a calamity to my child. Therefore, I see no reason why the change should be made.

A remark was made by Mr. Carlin, in relation to the conduct of these children in the chapel exercises. Some reference was made to it when Mr. Day was speaking. I do know to what Mr. Carlin referred, unless the explanation was given by Mr. Stone; but I do know something about the conduct of these children during their religious services, for I have been there myself, year after year, and seen it, and during this religious service, which lasts, perhaps, half an hour, I never saw a more attentive audience in my life. There are some 250 children in the chapel, the floor without carpets, and yet you can hear a pin drop in any part of the house. There is no noise whatever; the children are perfectly still, and their eyes are fixed with the utmost attention upon their teacher or whoever is leading in the service. The statement that these pupils are noisy, so far as the Hartford institution is concerned, (and of course I cannot speak of any other, except of an exhibition I once saw at the New York institution,) it cannot be sustained. Mr. Stone informs me that the services are about twenty minutes long. I had the impression they were from twenty to thirty minutes.

I referred to the military drill. I understand that since Mr. Green has gone to Washington, that drill has been suspended. It was the finest thing of the kind I ever saw. I think the military gentlemen on the Committee would be interested in it.

In relation to the mode of instruction, I can only judge by comparison. We go into our common schools in this city and other cities, and see the exhibitions of the scholars. What do we judge by? I can recollect the school-house where I used to go to school, back in the country; it was a very different school-house from what we have now-a-days, and the instruction, of course, was different. And let me here remark that the assertion has been made over and over again,—I think you will find it in this report, and I think reference is made to it in the report from Columbia College,—that this institution at Hartford has been in operation for fifty years, and the mode of instruction has never been changed; it has always been the same thing, right along. Well, sir, those of us who went to school twenty-five years ago were accustomed to read with our eyes and hear with our ears, and that is the way we instruct at the present time; but we have made changes in the text-books, we have made a variety of changes in regard to the mode of instruction. What is the testimony on this point? The testimony of Mr. Stone is, that during his first connection with the institution, although instruction was given by signs all the time, yet, so far as text-

books and such things were concerned, and the way of presenting things, they were entirely changed. Then he states that he was absent ten years, and while he was gone, another entire change was made. I believe the universal testimony is that these things have changed to keep pace with the times as much in that institution as any other.

Then, sir, it is persistently stated here, all evidence to the contrary notwithstanding, that they do not teach articulation at Hartford. One man gave me his positive testimony, that he knew they did not, because he had visited the institution twice with the Governor and Council, and never saw anything of it. Now, what I see with my own eyes and hear with my own ears, I think I have some comprehension of. I have seen that done for half a dozen years. One of the most important things that was called to my attention when I first visited the institution was how the voice of those having any articulation was retained. The lady who is now Mrs. Noyes, was employed at that time as a special instructor of this class of pupils, and Dr. Hooker's father will remember that the evening we were there, the scholars were called out and practised in that exercise before the committee, to show us distinctly how this thing was done. I was an inquirer on the subject, and was anxious to know, and I have been an inquirer ever since. I never go to the institution without taking the opportunity and privilege of asking any questions which I think will enlighten me upon this subject, for I feel a deep interest in it; and I have never visited the institution from that time to this, that I have not seen instances of every class of persons in the school who are practised in articulation. There are many gentlemen in the Legislature this year, who know of their own knowledge that articulation is practised there. To what extent, I am unable to say. I think the best exhibitions we have had of it have been here.

I think we can only judge of the mode of instruction at the Hartford institution by the results, the same as we judge of other schools. I speak with all deference, of course, when I say, that it must be gratifying to the parents, where the hearing of a child has been lost, as in the case of Mr. Hubbard's child, to have the articulation so much preserved, and to have been so successful in their efforts. But we find in a great many cases that we can learn persons to talk without educating them. The great desire of parents is to educate their children, to store their minds with instruction, so that they may become useful to themselves and to the community. How is it on that point, when we come to compare the child of Mr. Hubbard, with an intelligent mother and an intelligent instructor, constantly engaged for three years in teaching her, with other children of her age, who have had only the education of the common school for three years? You will very readily see the difference; and you will find in the report of the Columbia College that there is a

special article upon that point, and it is stated that the larger portion of the time which is spent in undertaking to educate children in this way is squandered. Not but that you may impart some knowledge; but when you compare the children who have been under Miss Rogers six months or a year, with children of the like capacity who have been at Hartford six months or a year, you will be surprised at the difference. Is not the object of education to impart useful information and store the mind with knowledge? And if this mode of education is much more successful than the other, why not adopt it?

There is only one other point which I think of at the present time; and that is the point which was undertaken to be made by Mr. Sanborn the other day, in reference to religious instruction by articulation. I say, "undertaken" to be made, because I do not think I misconstrue the language. If gentlemen will turn to their minutes, they will notice the question which was put to Mrs. Hubbard. The question put to her was, "Have you any difficulty in imparting religious instruction to your child?" The answers of Mrs. Hubbard show that she considered it an entirely useless question; and I think it was, because, if she can impart any instruction to her child, she can impart religious instruction; there is no doubt about that. But what was the point made? The point was, that religious *worship* is impossible where the system of articulation is adopted as the means of instruction. Religious instruction may be imparted to one or two individuals, but religious *worship*, which you and I like to engage in, is utterly impossible, under the mode of articulation, as has been shown here. What do Mr. Chamberlain and other gentlemen say in relation to it? Mr. Chamberlain says he might catch a very few words, if he sat right before the speaker, while Professor Bartlett can speak to a thousand people, and every one of them who understands the language understands what he says. That is religious worship. Not religious *instruction*, but religious *worship*. Under articulation, religious worship is utterly impracticable. The Committee all understand that, and I suppose have seen it.

I thank the Committee for the time they have given me.

MR. DUDLEY. You know how much is done now-a-days for children between four and eight years old, in the way of all sorts of contrivances and apparatus to help them along. Hearing children between four and eight years old learn their mother tongue; but these deaf-mutes are taught nothing all that time. Saying nothing about articulation, or Dr. Howe, or Mr. Hubbard, do you know any good reason why there should not be additional provision made for these young mutes in Massachusetts, if private munificence will furnish the means?

MR. STEVENS. Not the slightest.

Mr. DUDLEY. Could we not trust our Board of Education, or some other men not committed to either party in this controversy, to determine, after investigation, what the method of instruction should be?

Mr. STEVENS. I intended to say before, and I am glad you have brought up the subject, that this matter of the education of deaf-mutes is entirely an educational matter, and has no more to do with the Board of State Charities than it has with the inspectors of the State prison—not a particle. It is wholly an educational matter, and if anybody has anything to do with it, it should be the Board of Education. My idea is this, that private munificence has a right to do anything; but I am clearly of the opinion,—perhaps it may not prove so,—that if you should undertake to establish an institution, you might find a few individuals, perhaps, who would allow their children to go there before they were five or six years of age, but they would be very few.

Mr. DUDLEY. It would depend on how far they had to go, and how often the parents could see them, would it not?

Mr. STEVENS. Of course. I am informed by persons who know, that in order to do that thing successfully, you must bring the children together; and when you consider that the number of deaf-mute children of Massachusetts in the Hartford institution is one hundred and twelve, who come from seventy different cities and towns, it is plain you cannot bring them together in one institution, and have them board at home.

Mr. DUDLEY. I have not said anything about their boarding at home. Do you know of any reason why we should not have a preparatory school for these children, before they go to Hartford, or a higher school after they get through at Hartford? I am not expressing any opinion; but even with the kindest feelings for Hartford, I think a man may feel intensely that there ought to be some provision made for these young children; and I think the child who gets to be five or six years old ought to be put into communication with the outside world. That is what he does not have here; and there is no provision for that at Hartford. Do you see any objection to having two or three of these preparatory schools, if nothing more, and bringing them together within shorter distances?

Mr. STEVENS. I see no objection to private munificence establishing schools of that kind for this class of persons; but I do say, that they would not be patronized very extensively.

Mr. BRANNING. I understood Mr. Sanborn to take the ground that these children ought to be taught as early as four years old; and he advocated their instruction in the common schools. You know our law admits children to the common schools between five and fifteen. Do

you think it advisable to take the deaf-mute child, at the early age of four years, and put him into the common school?

Mr. STEVENS. I might have an opinion; but I have the idea that any expression of opinion on the part of Mr. Sanborn would be mere theory without any knowledge; and mine would be the same.

Mr. BRANNING. That idea was thrown out. I cannot see any reason why a child utterly helpless should be put into a school rather than a child with all his faculties.

Mr. DUDLEY. Would not the feelings of parents depend upon where the children were sent? Would they not prefer to send them to a small school, say of twenty or thirty scholars, with parental influences about them, than to put them in the school at Hartford, where there are 225 pupils?

Mr. STEVENS. All this matter of private schools depends upon those who are receiving the benefit of them. One person would be in favor, and another person entirely opposed to it.

Mr. BRANNING. Would not a child so young as four years need more attention and care than it would naturally get in the rough-and-tumble of a common school?

Mr. STEVENS. My present idea is that I would not send them away from home under six years of age, any way. But the argument against that would be, "You have never been a teacher of the deaf and dumb, and consequently you are not competent to express an opinion."

Mr. DUDLEY. Beginning at six, you gain two years over what you have now.

Mr. STEVENS. I say it is theory with me; it is practice with such men as we have had before us. I think their opinion would be better than mine.

Mr. BRANNING. Is there not always, at a common school, a disposition among the children, (innocent enough perhaps in itself,) to make sport of any child that has any peculiarity?

Mr. STEVENS. Those of us who were educated in the country at the common schools, know that if any child had a peculiarity or infirmity, it was very necessary that somebody in the school should have special care of that child; and when I had the privilege of being a teacher in a common school in the country, I always considered it a part of my duty to look after the weaker ones—and there are always more or less in a school. Persons who have a peculiarity of voice, or who have a weakness of intellect, and especially those who are deaf, are always imposed upon to a greater or less extent.

Mr. BRANNING. That is my experience.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask Mr. Stone or Mr. Turner to

state again why they object to admitting children to the institution at an earlier age?

Mr. STONE. You allow us to keep them but a certain length of time. The State of Massachusetts now supports them, I think, six years. During that time, they must get all the education they have. If your State allowed us to keep them ten or fourteen years, the matter would be very different; but, inasmuch as their education is confined within this period, we want them during the time when we can do the best for them.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this change of the limit from twelve to eight years, at the suggestion of Massachusetts?

Mr. STONE. Not specially, sir. We endeavor to arrange all these things according to the best of our ability, for the benefit of the children. It is not, as I trust the gentlemen of the Committee understand, to get patronage, but we wish to shape our course by the views and opinions of friends in this matter. It is decidedly against the judgment of those who now have charge of the institution, and against the opinion of the great mass of teachers, to commence this limited term at that age. We find that these little children, eight years old, cannot be confined, the first one or two years, five hours a day in school; they ought to be out at play, and they are almost entirely cut off from evening lessons. We wish to make the most of the time, and inasmuch as we have this limited time, we want to take the children when they are sufficiently mature to benefit by the instruction they receive, and when they will be most likely to retain the knowledge they acquire. If a gentleman is wealthy, and says, "I will keep my child with you until he is educated," then, if he comes at six years of age, there is not the least objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If Massachusetts should allow ten years, would you consent that children should begin at four years of age?

Mr. STONE. I do not believe in taking little children away from their family associations so early as that.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose Massachusetts places no limit, what limit would you fix?

Mr. STONE. My own feeling is, that children should have just as much of this home attention as possible—it is a very important part of their early education. I think children lose much, who lose the influence of family associations and family affections. I have not fixed in my mind the exact age at which children had better be removed from these, but I should think eight years was quite as early as would be advisable. The fact is, that the child can be taught before he goes to the institution, and the more he is taught while enjoying these family associations and the care of mother and father, and the companionship of brothers and sisters, so much the better.

The CHAIRMAN. How many female teachers have you at Hartford?

Mr. STONE. Four.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you confine the teaching of articulation to the female teachers?

Mr. STONE. Oh, no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know if articulation is taught in the New York and Pennsylvania institutions?

Mr. STONE. My impression is that it is taught, just as we teach it with these classes of pupils.

Mr. HUBBARD. You have no class in articulation?

Mr. STONE. We have none. I do not know that they have any in New York or Pennsylvania. The arrangement is what I stated the other day.

Mr. HUBBARD. Is there as much attention paid to articulation now as formerly?

Mr. STONE. There was formerly a special instructor for these children; now, there is none. We think they have more opportunity to improve and retain their speech. I hope gentlemen understood me distinctly on this point. We do not spend time in teaching the children to read on the lips. Our point is, to retain the articulation they have, and improve it. In our judgment, we can spend time more profitably than in teaching a child to read on the lips, if he has not that facility.

Mr. HUBBARD. Is the instruction anything more than asking questions?

Mr. STONE. All the inquiries of the pupil, so far as he speaks to us, are of articulation. Whatever he wants during the day, he asks for orally.

Mr. HUBBARD. Was that so two years ago, when I was there?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUBBARD. You mean to say, that was the rule? You do not mean to say it was carried out in every case?

Mr. STONE. It is very possible a child might speak by signs. We have persons who can talk as well as I can, and they can understand oral communications. I speak to them by signs, but when they reply, they reply in speech.

Mr. HUBBARD. There was the Tuck boy, who spoke very well, and yet it was almost impossible for the teacher to get him to reply in speech; and it was not until he was ordered to do so that he spoke.

Mr. STONE. These children all feel an unwillingness to speak, because they have the impression that it is unpleasant; and the more cultivation they get, the stronger that impression is. And yet our rule is to make them talk. A boy, if he can speak, must tell me what he wants.

Mr. HUBBARD. There was a black girl that heard quite well ; she used signs.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think not entirely. She did part of the time. I recollect the girl ; she was in my class.

Mr. HUBBARD. After attention was called to her as being a hearing girl, then there was conversation carried on with her ; but not until special attention had been called to her ; and so with the Tuck boy. My point is this : that the instruction of the Tuck boy and the black girl I saw at your school was by signs, on the part of both teacher and scholar, and not by articulation.

Mr. STONE. Our teaching is constantly by signs. We do not pretend to teach by articulation. It is very natural that children should speak in the way that they can speak most easily. If a child can speak easiest by signs, we wish him to. A child does not know less for knowing two languages instead of one. We know Mr. Smith and Mr. Chamberlain can speak very well, if they choose ; but how do they talk with each other ? They talk by signs. And why ? Because it is the easiest way for them to speak. I do not say that these children never make signs to us at all. I say, we usually make signs to them, but our effort is to make them talk to us ; and Dr. Howe has said that this is a more efficient way than giving them a half hour daily of special instruction.

Mr. HUBBARD. Do the other teachers take the same method ?

Mr. STONE. They do, more or less.

Mr. HUBBARD. Less rather than more, do you mean ?

Mr. STONE. Well, less or more—more or less. That is the rule of our school. That is the method we adopt to retain and improve their articulation.

Mr. HUBBARD. Do you teach them new words to articulate ?

Mr. STONE. No, sir ; I will not say we do not. Yes, we do. Here is a child who can speak pretty well ; he bungles over some word ; we do take pains to teach him to pronounce that word properly.

Mr. HUBBARD. Originally, it was supposed that articulation was useless. When were the views of the asylum changed ?

Mr. STONE. There was so much clamor about our being upon the wrong system, that when Mr. Weld and Mr. Day returned from their examination of the schools abroad, it was decided that with these two classes to which I have referred, more attention should be paid to articulation than formerly ; and in consequence of that, we had this special instruction, which continued, I think, as long as Mr. Weld remained there.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it possible for Massachusetts to lose her rights at Hartford, whatever action she may take ?

Mr. STONE. Unless Massachusetts refuses to send her children there, she loses no rights she has.

The CHAIRMAN. Can she not resume that right at any later period?

Mr. STONE. The fund has been managed for the deaf-mutes of New England. How the Directors would decide about it, I do not know. Their desire is to make it as useful as possible. I suppose that desire will continue to prevail.

Mr. MILLER. Are pupils received from other States at the same age?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir. Under our rules, we cannot receive a pupil under eight years of age; and, for the reason given, we prefer to have them more mature.

Mr. DUDLEY. I understood you to say, that these pupils could not board round, because the people in the neighborhood would not do their duty to them; that even parents, brothers and sisters, and relatives in their own families do not do their duty to these young mutes, and that they come to Hartford generally entirely uninstructed. If these little children, between five and eight years, were placed in small family schools, with a good matron, like Mrs. White, who would not have 225 children to attend to, would not the place of a mother be supplied to advantage?

Mr. STONE. I have no objection whatever to such an arrangement, if it could be made. It implies that you have competent teachers to take care of them. I think we have the same facilities, with the present number we have, for the care of the children, that would be had in a small school. It seems to me, that with the number we have, the evils we speak of are reduced to the smallest point.

Mr. DUDLEY. But you do not want children under eight, nor many more than you now have?

Mr. STONE. No, sir; 300 is the outside.

Mr. DUDLEY. I suppose there are 25 or 30 of these young children in this State who ought to be taught somewhere?

Mr. STONE. My own feeling is, that they ought to have the care of their family friends, or something equivalent to it, until they are eight years old. If you can substitute for family care this care in a family school, that may be an equivalent. I have nothing to say against that, if you can make such an arrangement. It seems to me very difficult to make it.

Mr. DUDLEY. How does the institution at Washington differ from your higher department?

Mr. STONE. Nothing more than in this: they have more teachers. They are organized for a course of four years. Some of their classes have only four or five persons in them. Our Directors have taken

this ground, and they always intend to maintain it, that they will give suitable instruction in any branches that children desire to learn.

Mr. TURNER. There are one or two points which, in the hurry of passing over my notes yesterday, I omitted. I will detain you but a moment upon them.

In the first place, I desire to say a word or two more in regard to the matter of articulation. I referred yesterday to the early efforts that were made at the institution by Mr. Weld, and quoted his testimony in relation to them. The fact that we made these occasional efforts in the way of articulation, led somewhat extensively to the impression, long before Mr. Weld and Mr. Day went to Europe, that we were giving instruction in the institution by articulation, which was not the fact. Mr. Weld says, in the report for 1836, (and he does it for the purpose of guarding against this impression,) "the attempt to teach articulation, as a part of the regular system of the Asylum, has never been made." Notice the phraseology, if you please, "*as a part of the regular system of the Asylum.*" The idea had gone abroad, that we were teaching articulation to all the pupils—to those born deaf, as well as to the semi-mutes. This was not the fact, and Mr. Weld did not wish any such impression to be created. To guard against any such impression, he uses this language—"The attempt to teach articulation, as a part of the regular system of the Asylum, has never been made." And it never was, neither under Mr. Gallaudet, nor Mr. Weld, nor myself, nor is it under Mr. Stone. It has never been a part of the regular system of instruction of the deaf and dumb, and I hope never will be, for I am firmly convinced that it is a comparatively useless branch in the education of deaf-mutes. In no case is it the source of any original knowledge in the mind of the pupil; in few cases does it succeed so as to answer any valuable end. That is the general rule; that is the rule the Asylum has ever been conducted upon. Now, he makes an exception. In his own words—"There are, however, cases of deaf persons who lost their hearing in childhood or in youth, after having learned to articulate, and who resort to us for education. The institution was not intended for them, but they come here, and we cannot avoid it, retaining, perhaps, the ability to utter many words and sentences, and sometimes a degree of hearing which is susceptible of improvement. In the case of several such persons, articulation has been taught as a part of their course, and with a good degree of success."

It is claimed, gentlemen, that our efforts were prompted by the agitation which was made by these gentlemen in 1840, and on to 1842, 1843 and 1844; that we were punched up, so to speak, (to use a plain expres-

sion,) in self-defence, to make use of this mode of teaching, to a small extent, to allay the public clamor that was rising in different parts of the country, because we did not do it. You see that these quotations which I have read to you were written many years previous to that time. Mr. Weld, in 1822, perceiving that instruction in articulation would be beneficial to certain classes who had speaking and hearing, and prompted by the desire for improvement, (the Abbé Sicard did nothing of this kind, so far as we know,) originated this idea, that these classes of persons might be specially instructed, and their articulation improved, and persisted for many months, as he says himself, in instructing a class of semi-mutes in articulation; and when I came into the Principalship, (as I believe I said the other day,) in 1853, on the death of Mr. Weld, I had previously been a good deal engaged in this same line, under his direction, as one of the teachers. I taught the first class of "perfection," as it has been called, the High Class, and I pursued the course indicated by Mr. Weld, teaching articulation a certain time each day to a certain number of my pupils, and a certain number of the pupils from other classes came into my class, making four, five or six, as the case might be, whom I was specifically directed, at a certain hour of the day, to teach, for so many minutes, articulation—to give them new words, and make such improvement with them as I could. In 1853, I brought the subject before our Directors, and told them I thought something could be done more systematically; that a lady who had some natural adaptation to this branch of instruction, who had a pretty good mouth of her own, and knew how to use her lips well, might be employed to advantage, to teach these semi-mutes, at specified times, every day. And, gentlemen, this was done. Miss Wadsworth, now Mrs. Noyes, who has been referred to by Mr. Stevens this morning, was in our employ somewhere from eight to ten years, and prosecuted this work the whole of that time. Her plan was, at a certain hour of the day, to bring in one, two or three of these pupils, (not in large classes; we do not consider that the best way,) and teach each one individually; and I must say, that I thought, and we all thought, that there was sufficient encouragement to continue this arrangement, and it was continued for that length of time. I must say, however, that while I think we benefited all those semi-mutes who could articulate pretty well, could use language to communicate their ideas in sentences, (and the more of such kind of teaching they can have the better,) those who could, when they came there, only articulate single words, like "father," "water," "boy," "butter," and those words where the enunciation is distinct on the lips, I do not think we improved very much. We never got them to speak off sentences. We could make them speak more of these single words, could teach them, perhaps, one or two little phrases, such as, "I am

well," in answer to the question, "How do you do?"—we accomplished a little; but we came to the conclusion, after following that course for some ten years, that, with the exception of those semi-mutes who could speak pretty well when they came there, our efforts accomplished very little. These efforts were made persistently, and I bear testimony that a great deal of patience was exercised by Miss Wadsworth in endeavoring to overcome difficulties. I was often present, and gave her all the assistance I could. There was the aspirate *sh*,—they could not get hold of that. "*Fish*"—they could not enunciate that. I would take the child's hand and put it to my mouth, and say "fish"; he felt that there was a blowing out there; and I practised all the arts that my ingenuity could invent, and all I could learn from reading, but I must say—and this is my testimony here—that with those pupils who could utter only single words, without hearing, our efforts were worth very little. I am constrained to say that, on the whole, I think the course now adopted by Mr. Stone is just about as efficacious for all that class of persons as the course I pursued for ten years or thereabouts—the only persistent effort, with an independent teacher, that has ever been made in any of the American institutions. Although we did accomplish considerable for semi-mutes like Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Smith, I must say, that for those who lost their hearing when three or four years old, our efforts were to very little purpose.

That is all I have to say on that subject; and I hope Mr. Hubbard will receive it as an answer to the question which he proposed.

Now, in regard to the supervision of the institution. There is one kind of supervision which has not been particularly referred to, and that is, the supervision of parents. There is scarcely a pupil brought there who is not accompanied by father or mother, or both; and although it is frequently inconvenient, we have been in the habit of accommodating these persons at the institution, instead of sending them to the tavern, and take the best care of them we can. Frequently fifteen or twenty come in a single day, and they often stay two or three days; and you can readily understand that in the hurry of receiving new classes, this is attended with a great deal of inconvenience; but for the sake of relieving the parental anxiety that they have as to the care of the child, which will be substituted for that of the mother and home, we have been willing to submit to the inconvenience. These parents go into the school-room, into the dining-room, into the lodging-rooms, (I do not know but they sleep with their children sometimes,) and go away satisfied. I do not remember that we have ever had an instance of a mother so weak as to say, when the time of parting came, and her child was in tears, "I can't leave my little one here; I must take him back home." They all say, "Here is the place for my poor deaf and dumb child, and

I am glad and thankful to God that there is such a place in the world where he can be taught;" and then they leave them.

Now what do we do? We say, they cannot write a letter for the first year. We do not expect they will. If a child is very intelligent, he may at the end of eight months; but we do not expect it; and we say to the mother,—“How soon do you want to hear about your child?” “O, I must hear in two weeks.” “Very well; then how often?” “What is the rule of the school?” “To write to the parents of every pupil once in two months.” “I can't wait so long as that; I must have a letter once a month.” “Very well; you shall have a letter every month.” A minute is made of that in the book of correspondence, and regularly, once a month, the parents are written to by the Principal if they desire it, and once in two months whether they want to hear or not. I believe there has been but one case where the mother said she did not care to hear from her child. I asked this lady how soon she wanted to hear, and she said, “I would like to hear in the course of a month.” “How often after that?” “Well,” said she, “no news is good news; if I don't hear from him I shall know that he is well. You need not write unless something is the matter with him.” That was not from any want of affection for her child, but because she knew that he was in safe hands, and that every care would be taken of him. But such cases are rare; mothers generally want to hear. Now, that is the fact; once in two months, during the whole course of their instruction, the parents of these children are informed of their condition and progress. As soon as they are sufficiently advanced, to write, they write without restraint what they choose. The teacher reads the letter on the slate, and if there are any absurdities of style, corrections are suggested; the child is allowed to copy it on paper, the letter is brought to the Principal's office, who adds what he may wish as to the improvement, health, &c., of the child; a record is kept of the date of the letter of each pupil, and the letter is sent off. That is the rule of the school, and has been from Mr. Gallaudet's day down to the present time. In old times, before we had so many railroads, the parents used to come to the institution with their teams at the end of the term, and spend a day in looking round and seeing how the children were cared for, and what they could do. This supervision has been continued ever since the commencement of the institution. The parents come there; our doors are thrown open; they enjoy our hospitality; they see with their own eyes; and they do not come home and say, “That is not the place for the deaf and dumb of Massachusetts; I wish you would make a place for them here, and not send them down to Hartford, where my boy went, and where I am sorry he ever did go.” No, sir; go through the State and ask the parents of our graduates what they think of the school, and I

believe you will find only one opinion. Mr. Dudley, of your Committee, has been so unfortunate as to have a deaf and dumb daughter. His daughter has been at Hartford; he knows the condition of things there. I do not think he will tell you that it is no place for the children of Massachusetts; and I do not think you will find a parent in all Massachusetts who will tell you so. And let me tell you, with great deference to the Committee on Charitable Institutions, that I think that supervision is worth more to the State, and has a better effect, than any supervision that committees appointed by the Legislature can possibly exercise, who come there once a year, and stay only a single day.

I have one other point, which has been remarked upon by our friend Mr. Stevens this morning, that this is not literally a humane institution. It is an unfortunate thing that we gave it the name of "Asylum." It is a pity, I think, that it was ever called an asylum, because that conveys the idea that it is a place for the unfortunate, and it conveys the idea, also, that it is a permanent institution, where they are to be kept. Now, neither of these characteristics can possibly enter into a school for the deaf and dumb. This is merely a school. We regard those children just the same as any other children. In fact, we do not regard them as unfortunate. We treat them all alike. If Mr. Dudley sends his daughter there, and pays his \$100, \$150, or \$175 a year, his daughter is not treated any better than the poorest Irish child you send there from this State. We take them all into the same rooms, to the same table, to the same school-rooms, give them the same instruction and the same treatment. They all fare alike, they are all taught alike; and our only business is to teach them—not to cure their infirmity. We are not an asylum; we do not attempt to practise upon the ear, nor very much, as you see, upon the voice. The object is to educate them. Then, on the other point: we do not advocate the idea that they are to remain with us. We do not want them there. The very moment their education is completed, we want their friends to take them away, or we wish to send them away and let them go to their homes. It is, therefore, in no sense an asylum, or their permanent home; it is simply a place for their education.

I will only notice one thing more, and then I have done. I am sorry to have detained you so long. Mr. Carlin, when he was before you the other day, uttered a fling against this language of signs, which I was very much surprised to hear from him. He says this is an unarranged language, entirely different from the language which we speak, and is a sort of "jargon;" I think that was the word he used. Now, gentlemen, that same Mr. Carlin got all the knowledge he has from that poor, imperfect, unarranged "jargon;" he got all his instruction, not through this oral teaching practised by the Germans, but through the sign-

language—this very language that he seemed to speak of so contemptuously. Mr. Carlin does not remember that all the ancient and classical languages of the world are arranged exactly in the order of the deaf and dumb language. Look at the Latin. How is that? Why, the subject is brought first; the predicate comes next; and lastly, the qualifying words; they are thrown in where they are wanted. That is just the way with the language of the deaf and dumb. The language of the deaf and dumb is more classical, more in accordance with the languages of those ancient nations which have made the greatest attainments in literature—the Greeks, the Hebrews, the Latins—than our own language is. It is our language that is misarranged. Suppose, now, I should begin a sentence like this: “If I should come”—(you get no idea; you do not know what I am driving at;)—“If I should come here”—(Now you begin to get something definite; something is going to be done *here*)—“to-morrow, would you”—(up to this point, you really do not know what I am driving at)—“hear me again?” Now you understand it. There is a specimen of a sentence, according to our best arrangement. The deaf and dumb would not say anything like that. They would begin at “Hear me;” then put in, “to-morrow.” They would say it perhaps in this way: “You to-morrow hear me if I again come?” That is just the way the Latins would arrange it; just the way the Greeks would arrange it; just the way the ancient classical languages would arrange the idea. They bring the prominent idea first. “I am going to the city.” They would begin with the word “city,” and then bring in the “going,” and “I.” I merely mention this to show you that it was owing to that gentleman’s ignorance of the construction of languages, (I will not say of the English language, for you see, from his communication, that he understands that,) that he said what he did. If he had understood the philosophy of language, he would not have complained of the language of signs as a “jargon,” because it was misarranged. So that all his testimony should be taken with a great many grains of allowance.

I am thankful to you for hearing me so patiently, and will not add anything further.

Adjourned to Tuesday, February 12.

SIXTH HEARING.

TUESDAY, February 12.

The Committee met at 10 o'clock, and Dr. S. G. HOWE proceeded to address them in support of the proposition for the establishment of a school or schools for the education of the deaf and dumb in this State. He said :

It has fallen to my lot, as Chairman of the Board of State Charities, to take a leading part in this discussion. Having been a teacher, so to say, of deaf-mutes, and having given the matter very great attention, during many years, I felt pretty well prepared, and supposed I could, without any trouble, make my views clear to the Committee. I find I made a mistake. Not being used to speaking to audiences, and especially not being used to much thinking on my legs, I may have wasted some of your time in useless words, and have spoken some words which perhaps would better not have been uttered. I thought it would be better, therefore, now, to prepare carefully what I had to say, in order that it should be more worthy of your consideration, and more reliable, perhaps. Unfortunately, I have been interrupted in this matter by sickness, and with other pressures and cares, I have not been able to do what I desired to do.

I will begin, with your permission, by asking the Superintendent of the American Asylum a few questions, which he will be kind enough to answer, so that we may start with certain premises.

1st. Do you think that the Directors of the American Asylum feel as much bound to promote the education and the welfare of the deaf-mutes of Massachusetts as those of Connecticut?

MR. STONE. Their past action shows that they have been placed upon the same basis.

DR. HOWE. These seem to be self-evident propositions, but nevertheless, for my own purposes, I want to lay them down, and have them assented to.

2d. Was not the purpose of Congress, in giving the land, from the sale of which the American Asylum has mainly raised its fund, to benefit the deaf-mutes of Massachusetts as well as those of Connecticut?

MR. STONE. The general impression at that time was, that one institution was sufficient for the whole country.

3d. Have not the inhabitants of Massachusetts contributed liberally and largely in money to the fund of the American Asylum?

Mr. STONE. \$5,600 is the whole amount—of the \$500,000.

Dr. HOWE. Is that as much, or more, or less, than that contributed by the inhabitants of Connecticut?

Mr. STONE. As much, fully.

4th. Do you adhere to your statement made to the Committee, that the Board of Directors of the American Asylum have the sole and entire control of that fund?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

5th. Do you or do you not think that in educating deaf-mute children for this life, the chief end should be to fit and prepare them for intercourse with hearing and speaking persons?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

6th. As a general rule, is it or is it not desirable that every independent State should have colleges, schools, and ordinary educational institutions for all persistent classes of children and youth, within its own borders, so that they may be subject to its laws, to the close scrutiny of its officials and citizens, and subject also to the moral influence of its own people?

Mr. STONE. I think that depends upon the size of the State, and other circumstances.

Dr. HOWE. That, I supposed might be objected to, and therefore I put it in as a proposition that can be maintained and defended.

7th. If such institutions are in themselves good and humane, is not their reflex action upon the community in which they are placed, good, both by training a body of intelligent teachers among the inhabitants, and by the example of diligence, order, thrift and respect for humanity,—to say nothing of the lower consideration of promoting the material welfare of the neighborhood in which it is placed and its funds disbursed?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

Dr. HOWE. That is a sound general proposition, is it not?

Mr. STONE. Oh, yes, general.

8th. Is there anything in the soil or climate of Connecticut, or in the character of her people, which makes it more desirable to establish and conduct institutions of education within her borders, rather than within the borders of Massachusetts?

Mr. STONE. In the first inception, perhaps not. After the institution is established, there may be reason for continuing it.

9th. You have stated that the Directors of the American Asylum virtually give to each beneficiary a considerable sum annually, equal to the difference between the cost of keeping him and what he pays. Now, since the fund which enables them to do this was confided to them as

much for the benefit of the mutes of Massachusetts as of those of Connecticut, and since they have the entire control of the fund, why may they not pay this to any schools established by the Legislature of Massachusetts, and thus save the deaf-mute children from being sent out of the State, and so far from home?

MR. STONE. I will explain the reasons, Mr. Chairman, if necessary. This fund was given to the Directors of the Asylum without any conditions whatever. They might have continued the institution as a Connecticut institution, under that name. They have thrown it open. I suppose they have no authority or power to alienate the fund, and remove it to a different place. It was given to that institution at Hartford. The benefit which other States enjoy from this fund is what has come from the Directors.

DR. HOWE. The gentleman has admitted what forecloses this argument entirely. He admits that this fund was given for the advantage of the deaf-mutes of the country. That implies a moral obligation to be fair and equal in its distribution. He has admitted that the Directors have the sole power in this matter; and if they are under a moral obligation, and have the sole power, they are estopped from saying that they can make this a Connecticut institution.

MR. STONE. I do not agree to that reasoning. This fund was given for the purpose of educating deaf-mutes at Hartford, and the Directors have used it in that way. They have no more right to send it here than to send it to California.

DR. HOWE. I am satisfied with these admissions; I want them put on record. If there is any virtue in the Socratic screw, the Directors are in a tight pinch, or there is no logic in my head. If they are bound to give the benefit of this fund as much to Massachusetts as to Connecticut, that implies a moral obligation. Mr. Stone admits that they have the power, and they are therefore bound to carry out that moral obligation. Why should a poor child down in Essex County—perhaps a lame child, perhaps an infirm child—be transported clear across Massachusetts down to Hartford, because the managers of this fund will not give to a child beyond their borders the benefit of the fund given to them for the education of deaf-mutes?

MR. STONE. I simply object to that as an entirely false construction. I say they are bound to use it *there* for the benefit of the deaf and dumb, not in California or New York. It was given to a local board, and they are bound to make the best use of it they can there. The gentleman's conclusion is an entirely false one from my premises. The grant was made to a local board, and in a specified locality.

DR. HOWE. Not according to Mr. Stone's first admission, because he said it was given under a moral obligation to use the fund for the

benefit of the deaf-mutes of the whole country. Now, if it can be proved that it would be for the benefit of a child down in Essex County that they should appropriate a portion of their funds to his education there, then, if they have the power, they are under a moral obligation to do it. I am satisfied with these answers, and do not wish to dwell upon them any further. If the gentleman is satisfied, I am glad.

Mr. STONE. I am not satisfied with their perversion at all. I am satisfied with what I said, and hold to that. Massachusetts as much as the other States, and no more.

Dr. HOWE. Well, if she has as much as Connecticut, when she cannot have the advantage of this fund to benefit a child down in a remote corner of the State, I cannot see it.

Mr. BRANNING. Would you contend that this is an ambulatory institution, to be transported to Essex or Berkshire, or wherever a deaf and dumb child is found?

Dr. HOWE. I think it is as much ambulatory as the Gospel, or as any other educational institution, the effects of which can be felt anywhere. An institution is not brick and mortar; an institution is not a set of men in a particular place. It has a local centre, from which radiate all over the land, good influences. The Missionary Society is not an ambulatory institution, but is it not felt to the remotest corners of the globe, and do not its ministers preach the Gospel everywhere? It is an ambulatory institution in that sense; and a deaf-mute institution whose centre should be at Hartford, may have its extremities down in Essex County, Massachusetts, as well as in Hartford County, Connecticut. It is not absolutely necessary that pupils should be taken there, to have the benefit of the institution.

Mr. BRANNING. Where are the funds of the Blind Institution and of the Massachusetts General Hospital used, which are given for the same general purposes?

Dr. HOWE. One of the last things I did as one of the Trustees of the Massachusetts Hospital was to vote a wooden leg to a man up in Berkshire County.

Mr. PERRY. Would these Directors have power, by their charter, to divide this money into six parts, and distribute it among the several New England States?

Dr. HOWE. By the admission of the gentleman, the Directors have entire control of this matter. I do not know whether it be so or not. That is his admission.

Mr. STONE. I do not perceive the point of the argument Dr. Howe makes. I have not the least objection to his making as much of it as he can.

Mr. BIRD. I would like to know what the conditions of the original grant were.

Mr. HUBBARD. I will give them to you by-and-by. The grant by Congress is "for the education and instruction of deaf and dumb persons." In the Act incorporating the Hartford Asylum, there is this sentence: "The institution was originally founded for the relief of the deaf and dumb, wherever situated." It was originally "The Connecticut Asylum," and the grant by Congress was to it as to the "Connecticut Asylum."

Dr. HOWE. I do not attach very much importance to this matter. I only wanted to show the conclusions at which we have a right to arrive from the assumptions and premises of the gentleman himself.

Massachusetts, more than any other State in the Union, perhaps more than any country in the world, abounds in colleges, schools, educational institutions of all kinds, charitable institutions, reform schools, and the like. She provides for the wants of every persistent class, even that of the poor idiots, and within her own borders, by the hands of her own people. To this general and most honorable system and condition of things, there is one exception—that of deaf-mutes. That unfortunate class, who, by the admission of all competent witnesses, need more than any other class to have all the ties of neighborhood, of kindred, of friendship,—all the associations of family and home strengthened in an extraordinary degree by their education, in order to counteract the tendency to isolation arising from their infirmity. They are made an exceptional class; they are denied the privilege of being educated among their neighbors and friends: they are expatriated during the tender years of their youth. This anomalous and extraordinary condition of things, involving an injury and a wrong to an unfortunate class, grew out of small beginnings. There was an apparent necessity for it at the outset, when only a half dozen mutes were to be provided for. Like greater wrongs, it was not noticed at first. It grew in obscurity—out of sight; attained strength by age; struck its roots deep into our habits and laws; and when at last it became of such dimensions as to attract notice, and when its evil nature was pointed out, then, like other tolerated evils, it was defended by interested parties, it was supported by timid conservatism, and clung to by some men merely because it was cheap. Inferior and poor as were most of the fruits of the tree, there were what seemed to be dollars glittering among them, and the sight of them hid the defects.

Finally, came the great and good secretary of the Board of Education, Horace Mann,—the great educator,—the practical reformer,—the codifier of your laws,—the father and founder of your lunatic asylums,—the reformer of your State common schools,—the founder of your

Normal schools ; a man whose whole life was passed in practical usefulness. He first came forward to show how entirely defective and insufficient was the system of instruction and care provided for our deaf-mutes. He pointed out its evils, and argued stoutly for radical changes and improvements in the system of instruction at Hartford. If he would not have our mutes taught at home where other children are taught, at least, he would have them as well taught there as they would be here. He failed ; and his opponents put upon him the charge of being a theorist and a visionary ; *he*, whose whole life was of practical usefulness, and who fell down dead, at work !

Then came the Board of State Charities and urged the entire abolition of the practice of expatriation, and called for the home education of our mutes,—saying nothing at all about the system by which they should be taught ; merely urging that they could be taught better than they had been taught ; that, in the natural course of events, everything can be improved ; and urging that, at any rate, Massachusetts should take them home and teach them there. This they did one year, after long deliberation, and unanimously ; and then they waited a year, and in their third report reiterated their conclusions, and again urged the Commonwealth to bring her mutes home.

Then came the Governor of the Commonwealth, with his blessed words of cheer and hope to those whom he tenderly called “the wards of the Commonwealth.” Then came the hearings before this earnest, intelligent and honorable Committee.

And who appear before you ? In support of the old established custom, in opposition to change and improvement, denying the expediency, almost the right of Massachusetts to educate her own wards, upon her own soil, in her own way, come the salaried officers of a close corporation, which has enjoyed a monopoly of educating the mutes of New England for half a century—and besides one stranger and one citizen of Massachusetts. These are all I can remember who have been before you. I am sorry that the citizen of Massachusetts (Mr. Stevens,) is not present, because I wished to enable him to correct one mistake, into which, I am told, (for I was not present,) he fell. I am told, that he fell into the mistake of supposing that the Board of State Charities are not unanimous in this matter. That Board, on this matter, is a unit.

Mr. BRANNING. I understood you to say at the hearing in the Senate Chamber, that the Board of State Charities were not agreed, or had no definite views about it, or were not agreed as to the mode and manner of instruction.

Dr. HOWE. Certainly not. But, however, some members of the Board may feel unprepared to recommend any particular mode of

instruction, the Board were unanimous in the opinion, that the mutes of the State should be educated at home.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to inquire if we have not been told all along, that the members of the Board of State Charities speak for themselves, and not as representing the Board?

Dr. HOWE. I do not know. I merely speak for myself; but I wish to correct a statement made by another gentleman with regard to the opinions of the Board.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you wish to say that the Board are unanimous in regard to the removal, but you do not propose to say what their opinion is with regard to articulation?

Dr. HOWE. I do not propose to speak the sentiment of the Board of State Charities with regard to articulation, only with regard to the removal. On that they are unanimous.

Mr. BIRD. I suppose you use the word "removal" for short. I understand you to mean the establishment of an institution here, for teaching new pupils, leaving the pupils now at Hartford to be taught there?

Dr. HOWE. I thank you for the correction, for I should be entirely misunderstood if I was supposed to say, that the Board of State Charities advocate the removal of the pupils from the institution at Hartford. We do not propose to remove those now there, but that, in future, all who apply shall be educated in the State.

The CHAIRMAN. I have never understood Dr. Howe to contend for the removal of those now in the institution at Hartford, unless their parents chose to avail themselves of the advantages of the institution in Massachusetts.

Dr. HOWE. I have stated who appear here on one side. On the other hand, come parties who have no interest in the matter, save a desire to promote the education and welfare of the mutes, and the representatives, if I may so call them, of the educated deaf-mutes of Massachusetts. They are the *élite*, the best pupils of Hartford, and, I believe, they all feel one way. I have not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with more than two or three of them, but they have been here at all these hearings, and I think they may be considered as representatives of the most intelligent and best informed educated deaf-mutes in the Commonwealth. They all advocate the change; I have heard of no opposition among them.

There are one or two topics upon which I wish to touch, and then to have the privilege of addressing the Committee in writing, preparing my argument more carefully than I have been able to do now.

1st. I wish to glance at the effects of the boarding-school system as pursued at Hartford upon the number of deaf-mutes in coming genera-

tions, and to show that, by favoring the intermarrying of mutes, as large associations upon the boarding-school system must necessarily do, the number of that class is actually made greater than it otherwise would be, the offspring of such families being more likely to be defective than the offspring of ordinary marriages. It is admitted on all hands, that the liability to the propagation of any infirmity is very much greater where persons having this infirmity congenitally marry; and very much more so when they intermarry with others having the same congenital infirmity. It is the old law of likes. We propagate our likeness, generally. Tall men, short men, and dark-colored men, light-colored men, irascible men, sweet-tempered men,—all these characteristics are propagated by this law, and so are all infirmities liable to be propagated. Now, if an institution is so conducted as to favor the intermarriage of this class, then one of the effects of it must be, that the number of that class of the community is increased considerably; and that I hold to be a very strong objection to a large institution for any class of infirm or defective persons, especially those educated upon the boarding-school system, as it is conducted in Hartford.

As I remarked, Mr. Chairman, I have not been able to carry out the elaboration of any of these points; but day before yesterday I hastily endeavored to make some calculations about this matter, deduced from the records of the Hartford school. I put the matter into the hands of a very expert clerk, to make the comparison. She gave me the result yesterday, and I said, "This must be wrong; the proportion of deaf-mute children cannot be so great as you make it from these data." She writes me this morning,—“I have conferred with Dr. Jarvis, who says that the calculations I made are strictly correct.” The facts as they now stand are as follows: Taking the total population of the United States, the whole number of deaf-mutes contained therein will be found to be four in every 10,000. The Hartford gentleman says one in 2,000; but as I understand it, that is not derived from the whole census, but from what were supposed to be more correct statistics in the census of the States. In the report of the Hartford institution for 1861, it is stated that of 287 children, the offspring of educated deaf-mutes, twenty-three were born deaf and dumb. It would appear from these statistics, that where deaf-mutes marry, it is pretty certain that eight per cent. will be affected in the same way as their parents, when both the parents are deaf-mutes. I do not attach much importance to these statistical inferences, because this is a very small number; and statistics are worth nothing unless they go over vast numbers and vast spaces of time, and are arranged in such a way that the errors on one side will correct errors on the other; but one thing I hold to be as certain as any law of nature, that persons having any congenital infirmity, are more likely to

have infirm children than others. If two persons having a common infirmity intermarry, then the liability to defective offspring is very much increased. I regard this matter as so important, that I will take the liberty to digress a little, and contrast the management of the institution which I have the honor to conduct at South Boston with the management of the institution at Hartford. I am so firmly convinced that this law is true, and that persons who have a common congenital defect are forbidden by the very constitution of nature from intermarrying, that I have felt from the very beginning that it was my bounden duty so to conduct that institution that the Commonwealth should not be burdened with one more blind child than it otherwise would have been; and therefore we take the greatest pains, incur very great expense, in order to keep the two sexes entirely separate. We bring them together only in the hall for common worship, or for their exhibitions. We have a teacher for the girls and a teacher for the boys, and they are kept entirely apart. I do not believe in separating the sexes. I believe in the good effects of having boys and girls educated together in the common schools, and I favor and cultivate among my pupils the idea that the more society they have the better, provided it be not among themselves. I want the boys to go out into company, and be acquainted with young ladies in the neighborhood; I want the girls to go out and be acquainted with the young gentlemen; but as to blind people I say,—“Hands off! don’t have any manner of acquaintance with each other.” We go to very great expense, as I say, in that matter. I hold that an institution which is so conducted as to facilitate, to encourage, to invite, almost, marriage between young people having a common infirmity, has a rotten stone in its foundation, and is on a wrong principle.

Mr. BIRD. Let me ask you, before you leave that topic, if you think that a larger number of the offspring of congenital deaf-mutes who intermarry would be deaf and dumb, than the number that would result from the marriage of those two persons with two speaking persons?

Dr. HOWE. Certainly. The closer the resemblance, the greater the liability to the continuance of the infirmity.

Mr. BIRD. Undoubtedly. But here are two congenital deaf-mutes who intermarry. Assume that eight per cent. of their offspring would be deaf and dumb. Now, suppose that these two persons should both marry a speaking person, would not the law require that four per cent. of their offspring should be congenital deaf-mutes, and thus the result would be the same?

Dr. HOWE. Here is an expert, (Mr. Turner;) I wish he would answer that question.

Mr. TURNER. I can state a single fact on that point. There is an uneducated deaf and dumb man in New Hampshire, (and this fault will

not always be confined to schools,) who married a hearing and a speaking woman, many years ago. They had two children, both of whom were deaf and dumb. One of these children married a hearing man, and they have two children deaf and dumb, who have been educated at the Asylum. The son of that man, who had a hearing wife, married a deaf and dumb girl, and they had two children, one of whom could hear; the other is deaf and dumb. So I think the gentleman's question can be answered: that there would be fully one-half as many of the offspring deaf and dumb, where one of the parents is a deaf-mute, as there would be where both parents are deaf-mutes. There are some forty or fifty deaf-mutes, who live in Boston and its neighborhood, who have intermarried, and there is but one family who have a deaf and dumb child.

Dr. HOWE. That is taking a very narrow view of this matter. We want to get at the general law.

Mr. BIRD. I want to know whether there has been any sufficiently wide generalization to establish a general law.

Dr. HOWE. There can be no mistake at all, about the fact, that the tendency to have defective offspring, is greater where the parents are defective, than with others. But here is a point that leads people into error. It does not follow, that because a person is defective in his hearing the defect will take that form in his offspring; it may strike somewhere else. The child may be defective in physical strength or mental capacity. But there is the defective germ, and it will manifest itself. It may skip one generation, and appear in the next. I know of thirteen blind children in a neighboring county, the descendants of one blind man who married his cousin. In the first generation, there was no blind child. You would look round and see these children, all happy, and all enjoying the blessing of sight, and say, "It is all moonshine, this idea about the evil of defective people marrying." In the second and third generations, came thirteen blind children. I think six of them have been in our Institution.

Leaving all these points for further elaboration, I am now prepared to close by saying that if the Governor and Council of Massachusetts shall be authorized by the Legislature to discontinue the expatriation of young deaf-mutes, and to have them instructed within the Commonwealth, responsible parties stand ready to receive and instruct them without greater cost to the State than is now paid for their instruction at Hartford. They propose more than one school, and more than one mode of instruction, in the choice of which the parents or friends of the pupil are to be consulted.

I ought, perhaps, in order to prevent any misconstruction of one remark which I made, say a single word more. I spoke of the appearance here of the "salaried officers" of the institution. I mean no dis-

respect to those gentlemen, whatever. Mr. Turner is no longer an officer there, I believe, and Mr. Stone, as I know very well, has no sinecure. I mean no sort of disrespect. "The laborer is worthy of his hire," and I know that Mr. Stone's labors are hard enough to compensate for all that he receives.

MR. BRANNING. Will Dr. Howe give us his precise views in regard to the mode of instructing these pupils—how many institutions he would have, and of what character? I am more of a practical than a theoretical man, and therefore I wish to know precisely the plan that is proposed. I admit the transcendent importance of the education of these persons in some place and in some manner; but I want to know, if we are to retain the mutes who need education, in this Commonwealth, to be educated, in what manner they are to be instructed, at what place, and so on.

DR. HOWE. The details will all be submitted to the Committee. You will have an opportunity, when you go to Chelmsford, of seeing something of the school there. In general, the plan of the friends of the measure is to establish another school in Boston, and a third school somewhere in the Commonwealth, to begin with; and they already see their way clear.

MR. BRANNING. You speak of one in Boston and a third one elsewhere. Would not that involve the same difficulty of separating the children from their parents and home, that there is now at Hartford?

DR. HOWE. It would not involve the necessity of separating from their families those who are in the city of Boston and its immediate neighborhood.

MR. BRANNING. We have a variety of institutions now. We have an Insane Asylum at Northampton, for the benefit of western Massachusetts, and those who avail themselves of that privilege have to go to that place.

DR. HOWE. I have nothing to say about the location. Northampton has been thought of by some persons. I know nothing about that.

MR. BRANNING. You claim that taking these children to Hartford, separating them from their parents and associating them together in such large numbers, is a decided disadvantage and injury to the pupils. Would not the same thing result here, whether we should conclude to have one, two or more schools distributed throughout the Commonwealth—would not the same separation from parents and friends result?

DR. HOWE. Very much less. We should reduce that to its minimum, instead of having it at its maximum. It is not necessary to have both sexes in one house.

MR. BRANNING. You would have separate schools for the education of deaf-mute males and females?

Dr. HOWE. I should certainly advocate that distinction.

Mr. BRANNING. That would involve two schools, and they must be located in places where they can be made available.

Dr. HOWE. We propose to reduce these objections and difficulties to their minimum. We do not pretend that we can overcome them.

Mr. BRANNING. If my child were to go to Northampton or Hartford, there would not be an hour's difference in the distance between them.

Dr. HOWE. No, sir; but if your child were to be boarded in a family, or to be associated with two or three hundred deaf-mutes, I should think it would make a great difference to him.

Mr. BRANNING. Should you recommend the Commonwealth to sustain schools in private families?

Dr. HOWE. The plan proposed involves no more expense than now. I would have the children educated in that mode which is demonstrated to be the best, cost what it may. When we sent our regiments to the war we did not get cheap lynch-pins or cheap anything else, we got the best we could; and, when we have a school, we ought to have the best school in the world. The cost, I confess, is a very small matter with me; but arrangements will be made by which the cost to the Commonwealth will be reduced as low as it is now.

Mr. BRANNING. I understand you to say that the education of these persons, in institutions like that at Hartford, has a tendency to produce intermarriages between that class of people?

Dr. HOWE. That is among the objections.

Mr. BRANNING. How would your plan prevent it? I suppose that scholars going there at eight years of age and leaving at fourteen or fifteen, would not be very likely to enter into any alliance of that sort.

Dr. HOWE. I don't know how it is with other people; but I was never so much in love in my life as I was before I was twelve years old.

Mr. BRANNING. Then you would discourage association between parties so situated, entirely?

Dr. HOWE. Entirely, sir. I would have them, if possible, board in ordinary families, and go to school as other children do.

Mr. BRANNING. You would discountenance association between deaf-mutes?

Dr. HOWE. Entirely; but, mind you, I would not discountenance association between them and other persons. I would endeavor to prevent the effects of their infirmity by bringing them into relations, as close as possible, with ordinary persons, so that their infirmity should be, so to speak, wiped out of sight.

Mr. BRANNING. Are there many instances of marriage between hearing and speaking persons and deaf-mutes?

Dr. HOWE. Oh, yes, sir; the men mostly marry speaking persons.

Mr. DUDLEY. If you could not possibly have anything more, would you not have additional facilities for pupils between five and eight?

Dr. HOWE. Certainly; I should consider that a great blessing.

Mr. TURNER. If the Chairman please, I will state in one moment, some facts on the point which has just been referred to. A convention met at Hartford, a few years ago, at which there were present three hundred and ninety persons, from sixteen States, and from seven different schools. One hundred and fifty of these were married, twenty-nine with hearing and speaking persons, and seventy-six with deaf and dumb. (I refer only to those who were there. In some cases the husband was there and wife was absent, and in other cases the wife was there and the husband was absent.) There were one hundred and five families represented; seventy-one of those families had children. The whole number of the children was one hundred and fifty-four, of whom eight were deaf and dumb. Three families, out of the one hundred and five represented, had deaf and dumb children in them.

Mr. BIRD. You mean that one hundred and fifty of the pupils married, and some of them married with outsiders?

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir; that is what I mean.

Mr. BIRD. Do you know whether those families that had the deaf and dumb children, were families where both the parents were deaf-mutes, or only one?

Mr. TURNER. No, sir; I think the report states, but I have not got it here.

G. G. HUBBARD, Esq., then addressed the Committee as follows:—

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee,—I hope the Committee will excuse me if I am a little tedious in the remarks which I have to make, as I shall have occasion to refer to some of the reports of the different societies, and to some books, to more fully illustrate what I have to say; and I hope the Hartford gentlemen, or any gentleman of the Committee, will interrupt me as I go on, if any question arises, or if there is any statement made which does not appear to them to be correct.

Why, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, are we here at the present time, and for what purpose are we here? The immediate cause is the reference to the deaf and dumb contained in the last message of His Excellency the Governor. He, with the Council, had visited the institution at Hartford, had examined somewhat the method of instruction pursued

there; had made himself somewhat acquainted with the general plan of instruction abroad; and the examination that he had made led him to suggest that it was now proper that the children of deaf-mutes from this State should not, as he expressed it, be "expatriated;" that they should not be sent to Hartford for instruction. Why should they not be sent to Hartford? Certainly not because the institution is a few miles outside the limit of the State; certainly not because it is not in Massachusetts. If that was the only objection, the Governor would not have recommended, nor should I be here to advocate, the establishment of schools in this State. There is some other objection, some other reason, than the simple fact that the Hartford institution is out of the State. The burden of proof is, of course, upon the affirmative in this case. We are to show the objections that there are to the present system of instruction pursued at Hartford, and the reasons why some different plan should now be introduced. Well, gentlemen, the first objection to Hartford is, that that institution is managed on a plan contrary to that upon which the charitable institutions of this State are managed; and, secondly, that there has been an entire change in the management of the institution at Hartford since it was originated, and since Massachusetts commenced sending her pupils there. The institution was incorporated in 1816, under the name of the Connecticut Asylum. By virtue of by-laws, which were made at that time, \$5 made the donor a member of the institution for a year; \$50 made any person a life-member; \$100 a director for life, and \$200 a vice-president for life; and by the same by-laws, the society, composed of these life-directors and life-members, were to meet annually and elect ten directors, who, together with the directors for life, were to manage the affairs of the society. Of the original thirty-nine life-directors, fourteen were from Massachusetts; of the twelve vice-presidents, five were from this State; so that at that time there were nineteen officers of the society who were from the State of Massachusetts. That, gentlemen, was the original plan upon which this institution was founded. Has it, or has it not, materially and essentially changed? Now, they tell us, it is a close corporation, consisting, I think, of ten directors, and four or five vice-presidents, who meet annually at Hartford, and go through the form of re-electing themselves, or such of their friends as they may see fit to elect.

Mr. TURNER. That is not quite true. Will you allow me to explain?

Mr. HUBBARD. Certainly, sir; I desire to have everything explained as we go along.

Mr. TURNER. The society, called the Society for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb, is called together once a year to elect officers; and it is not done by the directors themselves exclusively. They, of course,

belong to the association, but the officers are elected by this society, called together annually at Hartford, by public notice in the newspapers.

Mr. WRIGHT. What do you mean by the society?

Mr. TURNER. As just mentioned, the society consists of those who were originally incorporated, and those who gave a certain amount of money to the society.

Mr. WRIGHT. Are there any Massachusetts men on the board of directors?

Mr. TURNER. No, sir; unless perhaps one of the original life-directors still remains. But I do not think there is one. As a matter of fact, perhaps there are but few besides the directors who belong to the society, but an advertisement is every year inserted in the public papers, that the society known as the Society for the Instruction of Deaf and Dumb Persons, will hold their annual meeting at the State House, or at the rooms of the society, to elect their officers; and it is a fact, also, that all those original incorporators were continued in the board of directors, until they were removed by death; and since that time, others have been added by vote.

Mr. HUBBARD. I said, Mr. Chairman, that there were originally life-members, life-directors and life vice-presidents from Massachusetts, and that they had an equal voice in the management of the institution with the other directors. I say now, that there are no life-directors and no vice-presidents from Massachusetts on the list of officers. Mr. Day told us that the management was confined entirely to Hartford gentlemen. If I am wrong in that, the gentleman can correct me. I repeat, the management of the institution has entirely changed since Massachusetts began to send her children there to be educated.

And how about the funds of this society? The original amount of funds contributed was \$12,000. Of that \$12,000, \$2,500 were contributed by the citizens of Connecticut. The subsequent year, \$3,100 were raised, \$450 of that amount being contributed by citizens of Connecticut. Their fund now consists of \$290,000, \$278,100 of which came from the sales of land donated by Congress to the asylum. So that out of the \$290,000, about \$3,000 appear to have been contributed by citizens of the State of Connecticut. The institution, as I have before stated, according to the Act of incorporation, was founded for the relief of the deaf and dumb, wherever situated; and the plan then was, as we have seen, for all who contributed to its funds to share in its management.

The question was asked Mr. Stone, Supposing Massachusetts should now withdraw her pupils, could she at any future time get those pupils back again? Mr. Stone, I think, could not answer that question. I am happy to state, that I think that there can be no doubt that Mas-

sachusetts would have that right. In a series of resolutions passed by the board in the year 1825, and repeated in the year 1834, when a delegation from all the New England States except Rhode Island was sent to the institution, it was recited as follows: "It is understood that the privilege of participating in the funds in common with other States accepting the proposition, and of indigent individuals, is to be considered permanent." The arrangement, then, according to the vote which they have passed again and again, is permanent. The funds, as we have seen, were contributed by the States at large, and the arrangement is properly permanent.

But I have said that the management of this institution is different from that of all the charitable institutions in this State. There is not to-day a single charitable institution in Massachusetts to the funds of which the State contributes, that has not among its managers gentlemen appointed by the State. There is not a single institution, I think, of a benevolent or educational character in the State, over which it has not a visitatorial right—the right to examine and inspect all its concerns. In this institution, to which the State contributes nearly as much money as to any other, she has neither the power of choosing directors, or trustees, or vice-presidents, nor any visitatorial power. As the gentlemen have said, it is a close corporation, of the closest kind.

Mr. BIRD. Will you allow me to ask a question. How did this practice of having Massachusetts men on the Board of Directors fall out?

Mr. HUBBARD. In the first place, they died out; I think the last one died in 1846.

Mr. BIRD. There was no regulation excluding them?

Mr. HUBBARD. I do not know whether there was or not. I do not know whether the by-laws are the same now as they were at the beginning or not. Are the by-laws the same?

Mr. STONE. Substantially, they are. So far as regards that point, they certainly are.

Mr. HUBBARD. This institution was founded in 1817. And how was the system of instruction at Hartford originated? I think (if I am wrong, the gentlemen will correct me,) that the system of instruction at Hartford was, so to speak, entirely accidental. Mr. Gallaudet, who was the originator of the institution—one of the best men, probably, that ever lived, but, as was said by one of his oldest friends, "a good, rather than a great man; deficient in boldness and originality"—was sent abroad for the purpose of becoming acquainted with the system of instructing the deaf-mutes. He went, in the first place, to Dr. Watson's school, London, where the system then taught was articulation. He applied for admission in order to learn their system, but was refused. He

then went to the school at Edinburgh, where articulation was also taught, but where they would not receive any persons whatever as teachers. He was, therefore, cut off from these articulating schools, and was forced to go to Paris, where the system of De l'Épée and Sicard was in operation, which was the system of signs. It was, therefore, by an accident entirely that he went to Paris, and was instructed in the method of signs.

MR. STONE. I think Mr. Hubbard is slightly mistaken. Mr. Gallaudet was not forbidden to acquire the method practised in England, but certain restrictions were placed upon him which were not agreeable. They did not object to his learning the system and bringing it to this country, but he would have been required to spend a certain length of time in the institution. If he had thought that system the best, he would have submitted to the requirement.

MR. HUBBARD. In the first report which was ever made to the asylum at Hartford, it is stated that "Mr. Gallaudet did not meet with a satisfactory reception at the London Asylum, Dr. Watson's. He went then to Edinburgh. Here he met with new obstacles from the obligation which had been imposed upon the institution in that city not to instruct teachers in the art for a term of years. After these repeated disappointments and discouragements, (in which, however, let us behold a Providential hand,) Mr. Gallaudet went to Paris, where he found Sicard." Again, we are told, in the thirty-third annual report, "The difficulties which the narrow, monopolizing spirit of the earlier British teachers threw in his way most providentially obliged him to have recourse to Sicard, who held it a duty and privilege to impart his method freely to all inquirers." He was, therefore, by this "narrow spirit," as he says himself, most providentially led to go to Paris, where he learned the system of De l'Épée and Sicard. So that it was in this providential manner, as he calls it, that the system of sign-language was brought to this country. We are also told, that from that time, 1817, until the year 1844, no teacher of the deaf and dumb ever visited Europe or made any inquiries into the system of articulation. This system of the Abbé De l'Épée was a system which attempted "to give to the language of signs a development parallel to that of speech, having a distinct sign for every spoken word, with accessory signs to denote the grammatical characters." We see, therefore, that it was rather accidentally than from any other cause that this system of teaching by signs was first introduced into the American Asylum at Hartford; and from that asylum it was carried to all the other institutions in this country. It was a system of signs and signs exclusively; signs for all, and only signs for all. Articulation was not attempted at all in the early history of the institution. In the twelfth

report it is said that, "All efforts to accomplish articulation are now considered useless, and are wholly abandoned." At the very commencement of this institution, it was distinctly avowed, that articulation would form no part of the course of instruction; and thus matters continued from the year 1817 until Horace Mann went abroad and returned and made his report upon the German system. That at once aroused attention to that system throughout this country. Mr. Weld, of the Hartford Institution, was immediately sent to Europe for the purpose of examining the institutions abroad, and Mr. Day was sent from the Asylum at New York, for the same purpose. As soon as they returned there was a change made in the method of instruction, so far as articulation was concerned. A vote was passed at Hartford immediately upon Mr. Weld's return, "that in view of the facts and results obtained by him, with regard to teaching deaf-mutes to articulate, they would give it a full and prolonged trial, and do in this branch of instruction everything that was practically and permanently useful." Before, as you have noticed, they said they would have no articulation; now, as the result of Mr. Weld's visit abroad, they say they will teach articulation. Mr. Day in his report, also says, that there are certain cases in which, according to his view, articulation may be a success; and he annexed a note by Prof. Morel, a teacher of signs in a French institution, in which he also comes to the same conclusion. Prof. Morel, however, premises his conclusion by suggesting that "it would be easier to introduce articulation into new schools, rather than to attempt to introduce it into old schools, where the language of signs is carried to great development. "It is certain," he says, "the mechanical language in our schools intervenes too constantly in the relations of master and pupils, and of the latter among themselves." So, as the result of this "clamor" that was raised about this time, as we have been told, and as the result of the mission of these gentlemen abroad, there was a change in the plan of instruction at Hartford.

What do they seek to do at Hartford, and what do all who instruct pupils, whether deaf or not, attempt? It is to enable the pupils to communicate with others; to elevate and improve them, and instruct them in language. They say that at Hartford they instruct their pupils in the natural language of signs.

Mr. STONE. Mr. Hubbard labors under a mistake. We do not instruct them in the natural language of signs, any more than you teach your child English when you use English to explain French. We make use of this natural language of the deaf and dumb child to teach him our language. We do not give our children instruction in the language of signs, it is their vernacular language, and we take that language to instruct them in the English language.

MR. HUBBARD. What, Mr. Chairman, is language? The definition which Worcester gives is, "The expression of thoughts and feelings;" "the language of a people is the exponent of that people's feelings and thoughts;" "it is a very general term, and is not strictly confined to utterance by words, as it is also expressed by the countenance, by the eyes and by signs, as the language of the deaf and dumb; and we say not only the language of men, but also of beasts and birds." Every spoken language, therefore, is nothing but signs; every word we speak is nothing but a sign—a sign of a thought. They now use at Hartford, as they say, natural signs. They say they do not teach signs; they merely use natural signs as the means of teaching the English language. Now, gentlemen, what are natural signs? Animals use natural signs; all infant children use natural signs; idiots use natural signs; the deaf and dumb use natural signs. Let us see what natural signs are. According to the reports of the institution at Hartford, the signs which the pupils bring there, which are natural signs, are "crude, imperfect, and semi-barbarous." If they use natural signs, then, these are the signs which they use in instructing their pupils. "When the deaf and dumb are brought us," they say again, "their mental faculties are but little developed." "They have no medium of communication, but a few simple signs. Unacquainted with anything outside their own observation, their small stock of knowledge has been acquired by observation." "When they come, their eyes are indeed opened, but they have hardly been employed as avenues to the mind; that is, as yet unawakened, except upon the most trivial subjects. Even the language of signs is unknown, save in its rudest forms." Again they say: "The natural language of signs is almost entirely destitute of pronouns, conjunctions, adverbs, and the moods and tenses of verbs. All these must be taught at Hartford." And yet they do not instruct them in the sign language, they tell us. "The difficulty of the task (*i. e.*, of learning the sign language,) can be more easily conceived than described." But, Mr. Chairman, they do not use, as we think, the *natural* language of signs; they use something entirely different. In the book which I hold in my hand, called "Hawkins on the Constitution of the Deaf and Dumb," he says, "there are two classes of signs—natural and conventional signs." The natural signs are those which the deaf-mutes use before they go to Hartford; the conventional signs, and not the natural, are the ones in which they are there taught. He says: "It may seem almost incredible, that there are so many professional teachers who have spent the best part of their lives among the deaf and dumb, who yet are incompetent to carry on a discursive conversation in the sign language. So difficult is it for even teachers to understand this sign language, that for years many are unable to understand it." So again, in one of the New

York reports, they speak of the "Herculean and even vain labor of describing the principle of the unintelligible signs of this pantomimic dialect." And again they say: "Any intelligent person would find himself beset with not a few difficulties were he to attempt to learn from written descriptions only all the motions of the fencing-master or the teacher of gymnastics; but all these are but a drop in the ocean when compared with the countless number and ceaseless variations of the motions of the body, hands, eyes, head, etc., etc., which are required in the peculiar language of the deaf and dumb; but the skilful use of signs is far from all that is required. The teacher must not only know the language of signs, but the various exercises which are resorted to, and the ingenious modes of illustration which have been devised to aid pupils in the most difficult part of their progress. Sign language is perfected by forty years familiar use in a large institution, so as to make it adapted to the expression of abstract thought and nice shades of ideas, as well as the simple and more patent conceptions." Can anything of that kind be learned without instruction? They may not, perhaps, have any regular lessons in teaching sign language, as we did not give our little deaf child any lessons in articulation, or any lessons in reading upon the lips, and yet she is continually taught articulation by seeing us talk, by talking with us, by seeing the motion of our lips; so their children are receiving, every day, instruction in the sign language, from the time they go until the time they leave the institution. When they go, as we have seen, they know nothing but natural signs; when they leave they are instructed in very many conventional signs. The pupils think in these signs. They have said they are the means to an end. We think they cease with them to be a means to an end, and become the end itself of the instruction. They talk as they think, in natural signs; they converse among themselves by this means when left to their own choice. "The deaf and dumb," they say again in the New York report, "are always foreigners among their own kindred and neighbors; nay, more than foreigners. There are few deaf-mutes from birth, however well educated, who do not understand signs more easily and readily than writing, and find it more easy to communicate by signs than writing." We have all seen, during the progress of this hearing, the signs that are made by our friend, Professor Bartlett. You are able yourselves to know whether these are natural or artificial signs, whether the sign language is an easy method of communication, or whether, as Professor Bartlett would tell you, it is a most wearisome and trying labor—a labor which wearies him out day by day, as he translates to these deaf-mutes what is said in the sign language. Mr. Stone has told us that it takes four years before a teacher, although he is a graduate of a college, can become sufficiently acquainted with this language of signs to make a

good teacher for deaf-mutes. At the New York institution they put it at five or six years, instead of four.

Is this language, gentlemen, satisfactory to the deaf-mutes themselves? We have heard from them that the most intelligent of them think in this language of signs; they have had it preached to them since their infancy; now, are they satisfied with it? You have heard the evidence of Mr. Smith, Mr. Homer, and Mr. Chase. Two petitions have come in, signed by the deaf-mutes, objecting to this method of instruction. We have had the evidence of Mr. Carlin upon this same point. Dr. Kitto, who has been referred to, speaks of signs "as a means of intercourse which he always abominated;" he himself always conversed, not by signs, as he tells us, but by a different method. He says, "I now speak with considerable ease and freedom, and in personal intercourse, never resort to any other than the oral mode of communication." Dr. Kitto was a deaf-mute, who lost his hearing at the age of twelve years, and was referred to by Dr. Stone as one of the most accomplished deaf-mutes in the world.

This language of signs, then, becomes their mother tongue; it becomes their vernacular, as is said again and again in these reports. The English language is to them like the French language, the Latin language, or the Greek language to the scholar at school. While the pupil is at school studying these foreign languages, he has some acquaintance with them; when he leaves school and goes out into the world, his knowledge of these foreign languages is soon lost. And so we believe it is with the deaf-mutes who leave this institution and go away into the country; they do not preserve, as those who remain in cities do, their communication with each other, and, to a considerable extent, with the world around them, and their knowledge of the English language is gradually lost.

This system of sign language, as it seems to us, tends to isolation and segregation. Dr. Stone has objected to that expression, and says deafness is itself isolation. We agree that it is isolation; but the object of instructing deaf-mutes is to bring them into communion with the outside world. The instruction at Hartford does it to a considerable extent, but not to so great an extent, we think, as teaching ought to do it. We say that even here in Boston, the natural tendency of the deaf-mutes is to segregation—to forming a community by themselves. As we are told in one of the New York reports, the instructed deaf-mutes, if they could have their own way, would form a colony by themselves; but that, the gentlemen at New York think, would not be a very feasible or a safe undertaking. This system of teaching deaf-mutes the English language through signs, seems to us very much like undertaking to teach, if you please, a Greenlander or a Sandwich Islander, who is to

live all the time where the English language is spoken, the English language through the Greenland or Sandwich Island language. In order to teach him in that way, you must in the first place build up the Greenland language by new words introduced into it and made a part of it, and then, through this as a medium, teach him the English language. Why not teach him the English language at once, instead of going through this difficult process? Why not teach these deaf-mutes at once the English language, rather than teach them by these signs? It is generally supposed that the graduates of an institution are the best judges of the merits of that institution. We know that lately, at Harvard, the plan of choosing overseers has been changed, and now the graduates choose them. Judging by this rule, that the graduates are the best judges, what shall we say of Hartford, when we find all the intelligent graduates we have here condemning the system of education at Hartford—coming up here voluntarily, and expressing their own views and opinions? At a meeting of deaf-mutes held last night, certain resolutions were passed, which will be placed before the Committee, in which they, as a body, unanimously recommend the institution of schools in this State by the State of Massachusetts, in opposition to the Hartford institution.

But, gentlemen, great good has been done to the deaf-mutes at Hartford; great good is still done. The simple question is, is there any other feasible method of instruction? Is there any improvement upon it? We believe that there is in this branch of education, as in everything else, room for improvement, for progress. There is not, I think, a single foreign spoken language now taught as it was twenty years ago. Formerly, the method of teaching French or German, was to teach the pupil all the grammar at first, and after that, begin with the written or spoken language. Now, the system is, to begin at once with the written and spoken language. So, we believe, deaf-mutes can be taught, using, if you please, at the outset, the natural signs to teach them words, and then by the manual alphabet giving them instruction in the English language. How are blind deaf-mutes educated? By the manual alphabet, Laura Bridgman and Oliver Caswell, blind deaf-mutes have been educated so that they converse *nearly* as easily, *nearly* as correctly, *nearly* as rapidly, as these deaf-mutes. Mrs. Lamson has interpreted to Laura Bridgman with the fingers, sermons that our friend Prof. Bartlett has preached, as rapidly as he has spoken it to deaf-mutes. If blind deaf-mutes can be instructed by the manual alphabet, why cannot ordinary deaf-mutes, who have the use of their eyes, as the faculty through which, in point of fact, they learn the language? We do not therefore, as I have said, reject natural signs; and in addition to the manual alphabet and signs, we would teach them to read from the lips.

This reading from the lips, is something which any ordinary deaf-mute, without great difficulty, can learn. I do not mean to say, that they can read the ordinary conversation of every person from their lips; but I do mean to say, that they can read from the lips of very many more than they can communicate with by means of signs. I do mean to say, that they can understand much more, and can communicate much better by articulation, and with many more than deaf-mutes instructed by sign-language can.

The CHAIRMAN. Which shall we understand you would teach first?

Mr. HUBBARD. I would teach deaf-mutes who cannot articulate the use of the English language by using, to a certain extent, what they call "natural signs." We thus teach them the English language. For instance: we have been told that they teach the deaf-mute what the sign of drink is, by holding a tumbler up to the mouth. Well, how did Mrs. Lamson teach Oliver Caswell, who was entirely ignorant? She put a key into his hand. He took it, and turned it. Oh, yes, he knew what that meant. That was the natural sign-language. She then took the key and spelt on his fingers the word k-e-y, with the manual alphabet; it made no impression. She then took a cup. Oh, yes, he knew what that was for—it was to drink from. She then spelt c-u-p with his fingers; that produced no more impression than the other. She then took a chair. He knew what that was; to sit down upon. She then spelt c-h-a-i-r with his fingers. She then went back again to "cup," and spelt that; then "chair," and spelt that; and then "key;" and then he began to perceive that k-e-y meant something. His eye brightened, intelligence was visible upon his countenance; he went round the room spelling everything there was in the room upon his fingers, and in less than one hour, that poor deaf-mute knew what the English language meant, interpreted by natural signs.

Mr. STONE. That is precisely the way they do at Hartford.

Mr. HUBBARD. I know it; only they make use of these natural signs to teach other signs; and the scholars are instructed in signs from the time they enter the school to the time they leave it.

Mr. STONE. I am sorry Mr. Hubbard misunderstands us; but we do not teach signs. That is not our point. It is to teach objects, words; to give ideas; it is not to teach signs.

Mr. TURNER. I would like to make just one explanation. The very first thing that we begin to teach is a word. Take the word h-a-t. That is written down on the slate, in the presence of the new pupil, and the very first effort is to get him to make the letter *h* on the hand; then the *a*; and then the *t*. Then we make a little sketch of a hat, or have one brought in, and get him, in the same way that Mrs. Lamson did that blind boy, to associate the written word with the thing.

That is the order of the exercises in the school-room, from the time the pupil begins until he ends. The word is written, spelt, and then comes the sign. The signs are merely auxiliary. The writing comes first; the spelling on the fingers is the next step; and the sign to illustrate.

Mr. HUBBARD. This is merely a discussion about names; it does not amount to any thing. I repeat what I have said, that the children taught at Hartford are taught by signs; that when they meet their teachers, they talk to their teachers by signs; that when they play among themselves, they play by signs; that when they think, they think in signs; that when they dream, they dream in signs. And I say, (and the reports one after another will confirm what I say,) that with the most intelligent deaf-mutes, the sign-language, to the end, is their mother tongue, their vernacular, and the English language to them is a foreign language; I say that at Hartford they teach the scholars sign-language; I say, (as these reports say,) that this sign-language, built up by an experience of forty years, is a thing that has been studied and thought out, and is taught there; and the difference is that Laura Bridgman and Oliver Caswell know, and understand, and think, in the English language; they do not know a sign; they do not think in signs; they do not dream in signs; all the operations of their mind are in the English language, while every one of these deaf-mutes, as they will tell you themselves, think more in signs than they do in the English language. This is an end which we wish to avoid in the teaching of deaf-mutes. We want to teach them the English language, because we believe it is superior to the language of signs.

Well, gentlemen, they have informed us on the other side that we have told them nothing new; that nothing new has been advanced. We can also say, I think, that we have heard from them nothing new. We have not been discouraged by what we have heard. We have heard before, gentlemen, of all that has been done in Europe in regard to articulation. And how and when did we hear of it? We were endeavoring to teach our poor little girl the English language, instead of the language of signs. We asked if articulation was not taught abroad. "Oh, yes; but then it is not equal to the language of signs. Here is Professor Day's report; just take it and read it; see what Professor Day says has been done abroad." Still, we went on instructing our little girl in the English language, never using a sign of any kind, and we seemed to make progress. We asked them, "Is it not possible to use articulation?" "Oh, no! Here is Mr. Weld's report. He has been abroad. He knows all about it. Articulation cannot be taught." Well, we went to them again, asking them still further. "Oh, no; here is Mr. Peet's report, and Mr. Day's second report; they have been over the ground again. In all the institutions in

Europe, articulation is a perfect failure, and every articulating school a failure." Still, gentlemen, we were not discouraged. We have kept on with our little child, and she can, to a certain extent, as you have heard, articulate. Two years ago, we appeared before a committee of the legislature, and urged the establishment of schools for deaf-mutes. We were afraid to bring little May before the committee then. We feared that, if we brought her here, the committee would say, "Is that all you have done? Can't she articulate any better than that? We cannot understand a word she says. She cannot read from the lips, and she does not apparently know anything." We were afraid it would be a complete failure; that what she had done then would demonstrate the want of success of our plan, and therefore we did not dare to bring her. But still, we knew then that she would improve, that she would learn. You have seen her yourselves; you have seen that she must have made progress within the last two years; and we have no doubt that still greater progress is yet before her, and that she will be able to articulate distinctly—quite distinctly. When little May first lost her hearing, we went to Providence to see little Jenny Lippitt, and we were almost discouraged as we heard her indistinct articulation. We could understand hardly a word she said. She read from a book, and we could not understand anything she read without looking on the book—not a single word. We said, "Is this all?" And yet this same little Jenny Lippitt, at a fair in Providence lately, had the entire charge of a table for the selling of lemonade, waited upon the customers, and made all the change, and a majority of them never knew she was a deaf-mute. It is of this class especially that we speak. They can be taught articulation. We are not here recommending for an instant the teaching of congenital deaf-mutes articulation. It may be successful; it may not be. We do not urge it; we do not pretend that it can be. What we do say is, that there is a large number of semi-mutes and semi-hearing people who can be taught articulation.

Now, gentlemen, what is the number? Is it sufficient for the establishment of a school? The Hartford gentlemen would have us understand that it is not. They say that about one-twentieth of the entire number at Hartford are of this class. Then how is it, gentlemen? The number of congenital deaf-mutes in Europe is greater, much greater, than in this country. There are fewer congenital deaf-mutes in this country now than there were 20 years ago. There are probably fewer deaf-mutes now throughout all our land than there were 40 or 50 years ago. (I mean, fewer in proportion to the entire population.) Of the deaf-mutes at the New York Institute for Deaf-Mutes for the last 20 years, less than one-half are congenital cases; two-tenths of the whole lost their hearing under two years of age; three-tenths, over four years;

(that is, three-tenths of all the cases at Hartford for the last 20 years have at some time had hearing, and at some time have spoken.) In addition to these, there are those who are only semi-deaf; so that the entire number would probably be about one-half of semi-mutes or semi-deaf people. And yet they tell us that at Hartford it is reduced to one-twentieth. How does this reduction from one-half to one-twentieth take place? Our own case will illustrate it, and show how it may very easily take place. Our little child lost her hearing when she was about five years old. She could talk a little; she did not know all the letters, though she knew most of them. We had never thought it worth while to hurry her education, as we have that of our younger children. We consulted Mr. Gallaudet, the son of Dr. Gallaudet; we consulted with our good friend Prof. Bartlett, and with other gentlemen; and they told us the child could not keep her speech three months. Mr. Gallaudet said it was not worth while to try to keep her speech.

Prof. BARTLETT. I said, now is the time to begin. If you did not begin then, you would not keep it three months; if you began then, and made strenuous efforts, you could keep it. I certainly insisted on immediately beginning.

Mr. HUBBARD. What I should have said was, that Mr. Gallaudet told us we could not keep the speech of that child three months. That is what Mr. Gallaudet told us,—a man who has spent his life in instructing these persons, whose father spent his life in the same work, whose mother was a deaf-mute, and whose wife, I believe, is also a deaf-mute. Mr. Bartlett told us to keep on, and he is the only teacher of deaf-mutes who gave us the slightest encouragement; and he told us he was afraid her articulation would be so unpleasant, even if we preserved it, that we should not want to hear her talk.

Prof. BARTLETT. I stated the difficulties strongly, because I wanted to stimulate you to make every possible effort. I want all the credit I deserve on that point.

Mr. HUBBARD. I say, you were the only person who gave us the slightest encouragement. Everybody else said it was impossible to preserve her speech.

Mr. STONE. I hope you do not infer that I should take that ground at all. Mr. Bartlett has explained what he said. I am confident that Mr. Gallaudet would have said that if you did not constantly practise with that child, she would lose her speech. That is simply the ground I take, always. If a child has any articulation, you can continue it and improve it; but not without.

Mr. HUBBARD. I cannot say what Mr. Gallaudet intended; I can only say what he said; and when, two years ago, we met him, with our

little girl, and she spoke to him, he said, with a sigh of regret, "But she will lose this beautiful language of signs!" Yes, gentlemen, these Hartford gentlemen have seen what sign-language can do,—that it can raise the poor deaf-mute from almost an idiot to become an intelligent person, and they are devoted to the language of signs, because through it they have made this great progress in the education of their pupils.

As I have said, gentlemen, the feeling of all persons who knew anything about deaf-mutes was to discourage us from undertaking to teach our little girl articulation. She, herself, was unwilling to speak. Dr. Kitto writes as follows, (which will illustrate still further the reason why so many lose their speech): "Although I have no recollection of physical pain in the act of speaking, I felt the strongest possible indisposition to use my vocal organs. I seemed to labor under a moral disability, which cannot be described by a comparison with any disinclination which the reader can be supposed to have experienced. The disinclination which one feels to leave his warm bed on a frosty morning is nothing to that which I experienced against the exercise of any of the organs of speech. The force of this tendency towards dumbness was so great that for many years I habitually expressed myself to others in writing, even when not more than a few words were necessary. Signs, as a means of intercourse, I always abominated, and no one could annoy me more than by adopting this mode of communication." He then goes on to tell us of the manner in which he was forced to use his powers of articulation. It was so with our little child. If she had not been forced to speak, she would have lost that power entirely.. We knew no signs; we know no signs now. We did not know the manual alphabet then; and there is not a single member of our family who knows the manual alphabet now. Our little girl does not know it. She was forced, therefore, to resort to articulation if she would know anything. Well, does she know anything? You have seen her, gentlemen, and had an opportunity to test her to a certain extent; and I have here a note from one of the teachers in Cambridge, in which she says:—

"I have been exceedingly interested in examining the little Mabel, and I am happy to say that she will compare very favorably with children of her own age, and is somewhat in advance of the average of those of ten years, (Mabel is nine,) who have come under my instruction. I am surprised at the readiness with which she reads from the lips, as I have never talked with her before, and she understood the questions without difficulty.

"Yours very truly,

"A. M. IRESON."

This teacher is a young lady with whom we were entirely unacquainted, and who had never been to our house before the day she came to make this examination of our little girl.

There is a feeling throughout the community that if a child loses its hearing, that child must be forever a deaf-mute; and that feeling, I must say is encouraged by the teachers of deaf-mutes; honestly and truly encouraged, because they believe in teaching by signs. I am not certain that they would not teach hearing children by signs, they have so great faith in them; I am certain they would have my little child instructed by signs rather than by articulation. You must, then, counteract this opinion, have it understood that deaf-mutes, who lose their hearing at a certain age, can keep up their articulation; you must have it understood that there are schools where these little deaf-mutes can be taught articulation; then, when it is generally known throughout the community that their speech can be retained, the work is half done, and instead of one in twenty, there will be one-half of these deaf-mutes whose articulation will be preserved.

But they say they teach articulation at Hartford. How is it taught? Mr. Turner has told you that they taught the Bliss boy, who went there sometime ago, altogether by signs. He could articulate pretty well, yet still he was taught altogether by signs.

Mr. TURNER. Did I say altogether by signs?

Mr. HUBBARD. I have understood the Bliss boy was so taught.

Mr. TURNER. No, sir; I did not say altogether by signs. We articulated with him constantly every day.

Mr. HUBBARD. So when I visited the institution once there was a boy by the name of Tuck, who talked quite well, and yet the communication between him and his teacher was by signs and not by articulation. The boy did not like to articulate. There was the same difficulty with him that there was with Dr. Kitto. He could talk more easily by signs than he could by the English language, and therefore he preferred them. There was a black girl there at the same time who could hear quite well, and her conversation was almost entirely by signs.

But they tell us there is nothing new in our method of instruction. Do they know what our method of instruction is? We have a school at Chelmsford. Have they ever been there? I believe not. They do not know, I think, what the system of instruction is; we teach at Chelmsford without the use of signs. Signs are forbidden in school and out of school.

Mr. STONE. Are not signs used in school?

Mr. HUBBARD. Very little indeed, sir; scarcely ever.

Mr. STONE. I understand that they converse with each other entirely by signs.

Prof. BARTLETT. You will find that these children play by signs; I have seen them.

Mr. HUBBARD. I had the pleasure last night of dining with Prof. Park, of Andover, who was in Germany about a couple of years ago, and examined the schools there. He says the instruction was communicated by articulation, and many of the pupils conversed with each other through the means of articulation. Before I go on, I would like to ask Mr. Talbot whether he understands that the sign-language is used at Chelmsford?

Mr. TALBOT. I understand that the method of instruction and also the communication between the pupils are altogether by articulation. They are so, so far as I have observed.

Mr. STONE. The point is, whether they converse by signs or not. Kaufman testified that his teachers and fellow pupils conversed by signs almost entirely.

Mr. TALBOT. I have noticed these children play together, and I have noticed that they communicate by articulation. They are forbidden to communicate in any other way.

Mr. HUBBARD. I have understood it as Mr. Talbot has stated; and not only that, but I have also understood that the scholars knew nothing of signs, and therefore cannot use them. Prof. Park said that he saw several of the teachers of the German schools, and they expressed their very great surprise that a gentleman of Prof. Day's learning and ability, should have written such a report as he had, after visiting the German institutions. They thought it did not give a fair representation of the results of their instruction. He said that the teachers were perfectly enthusiastic upon the method of their system; he told a long American story to one of the teachers, and the teacher gave it to the pupils; and it was evident from the manner of the pupils that the story was understood by them from beginning to end. He has promised to write me a letter giving his views in regard to the German system, which I shall have the pleasure, when received, of laying before the Committee.

We teach, I say, articulation to these semi-mutes without signs, and we allow no signs to be used. What are the objections which they make to this plan? They say that only a few persons can understand the pupils using it; and such pupils can understand only a few; that only a few can be taught by one teacher; that they can only read from the lips near by, where it is light; that much time is required for teaching them to articulate; and that the pupils learn less than by the sign-language.

Only a few can understand the pupils, and such pupils can understand only a few. Does not such an objection apply just as much to the method of teaching at Hartford as to our method? Is there one member of this Committee who understands any one of the "natural signs" that have been made in their presence? That objection applies equally

to their method of instruction as to ours, and with still greater force, because any of these pupils who are taught to articulate can be understood, with difficulty, by other people, and they can understand those who speak to them by the lips ; not every one, but every one who talks plainly and distinctly.

“Only a few can be taught by a single teacher.” Perhaps fewer can be taught at the outset, but then it does not require so high a grade of teachers to teach them as is required at Hartford. At Hartford it requires college graduates, who spend from four to six years in learning this language of signs, before they are capable of teaching it. In this State, the majority of teachers are young ladies ; and young ladies have been found to be perfectly competent to teach our method ; so that, although it may require more teachers, the expense of the instruction will be much less than it is at Hartford.

“They can only read from the lips near by.” Our little girl can read, I think, from lips as far off as we talk with any person. The experiment was made the other day with two of Miss Rogers’ pupils, and it was found that at a distance of thirty-nine feet, they understood nearly all that was said.

“The pupils learn less than by sign language.” We think our little girl has not learned less, and that you will not find, when you visit the school at Chelmsford, that the pupils there have learned less than those instructed the same length of time at Hartford. But, gentlemen, we do not wish that you should have any great expectations with regard to what you will see at Chelmsford. At Hartford they have fifty years the start of us. They have teachers who have had a life-long experience in the art of teaching this particular class of scholars ; they know how to teach better than we do, and the instruction there cannot be compared with that at Chelmsford. This is a new school ; neither of the teachers had any experience in teaching deaf-mutes before they began their little school. You may not be able, probably will not be able, to understand a single word that any one of the articulating scholars speaks ; they may not be able to read a single word from your lips ; and yet it is the beginning, we hope, of great things. We think you will find that these children, considering the infancy of the undertaking, have made some progress in learning. We think you will find that they have made a start, and that their future progress will be greater than it has been.

What definite, what practical plan do we propose for the education of deaf-mutes ? It is this, gentlemen. That you shall give to some gentleman who will make the necessary application, a charter for the purpose of establishing one or more schools in this State for the instruction of deaf-mutes. That charter being granted, we propose to ask that

the State shall make the same appropriation to scholars who may desire to go to these schools that they do to those who go to Hartford. We do not wish to begin on any great scale. We have no objection to having the age limited at first to those from five to ten years. We propose to continue the school now at Chelmsford, where semi-mutes and semi-deaf people, and those congenital deaf-mute children whose parents may desire to attempt their instruction in articulation, may be sent. Then we propose to open another school at Boston, where other deaf-mutes may be taught, perhaps by the language of signs, (for we will not object to using any system by which we can teach the deaf-mutes, although I do not myself believe in the language of signs,) but using more the manual alphabet than signs. Then we propose to establish another school, if you please, in Northampton. Beginning in a small, humble way, we wish to see if we cannot teach these semi-mutes, if we cannot, by beginning at the early age of five years, restore articulation to those who have lost it, and fit them for some higher school—fit them, if you please, for Hartford; but, at any rate preserve for these young semi-mutes, their powers of articulation.

This, gentlemen, is the general view which we have taken of the subject. We are here on our own behalf, without any connection in this matter with Dr. Howe or with the State Board of Charities. Whatever Act of incorporation should be granted, we should of course expect that the State would reserve as in other similar instances the power and the right of appointing a certain number of Directors in the institution, and of preserving over it the visitorial power which they have over all other institutions in the State.

MR. DUDLEY. Would you not consider it a great gain, if the question of articulation were to be waived at the start, to have provision made for pupils between the ages of five and ten, leaving it to men not committed either way to determine the method of instruction? Do we not want such a school, whatever the method of instruction may be?

MR. HUBBARD. I have no doubt that would be a great gain. I think that was what I stated. We have one school at Chelmsford where they may be taught articulation. That is to be continued. It makes no difference whether the State helps it or not, that school is going on; the experiment is to be tried of teaching semi-mutes articulation. When we were here two years ago, it was said to the Committee that there had been no attempt made to establish a school, that nothing had been done. Now we have got a school, and you are going to see it. That school is to be continued. But I am not wedded to the idea of teaching articulation to deaf-mutes; I doubt very much whether it can be taught to congenital deaf-mutes; but I do believe in teaching these young semi-mutes the English language.

MR. DUDLEY. I want to say one word. I can easily understand why the Hartford gentlemen are sensitive on this matter. For instance, if Massachusetts establishes an institution that competes with them directly, or is hostile to them, or is a rival, it would be saying to the other New England States, practically, that Massachusetts has lost confidence in the American Asylum; that is, such would be the natural inference. Now, I want to ask the Hartford gentlemen a question with regard to pupils with respect to whom the establishment of schools in this State would not have this effect—pupils too young to go there. I would like to ask Mr. Stone, if, in his opinion, we could not profitably to that unfortunate class make provision in Massachusetts for those between the ages of five and ten years; say two or three little schools in different parts of the State, so that tender mothers would be willing to let their children go to them? Whether, in his opinion we could not do them a great deal of good.

MR. STONE. The managers of the institution at Hartford, so far as I know, have not the least objection to any such experiment being tried, and certainly, so far as my own feelings are concerned, I have not. I stated the reason why we desired not to take pupils younger than ten or twelve years of age—because we could keep them only a limited time. If we could have them ten or fifteen years, that objection would be obviated. As we can only have them six or seven years we want to take them at a time when we can do them the greatest possible good. But we have no objection to this experiment of a preliminary school, where they can get an earlier education, being tried.

MR. HUBBARD. I have no feeling of hostility towards Hartford. I hope I have not said anything, I think I did not say anything of that kind. I certainly did not mean to. I know the gentlemen there are actuated by the highest, and purest, and best motives. I know they believe thoroughly in their system; but I have never heard yet that a little rivalry in education or anything else was anything but a great blessing. I have never supposed, because we had two or three colleges in this State, that therefore the students were not so well educated as they would be if there was no rivalry in the matter. Two years ago, when I appeared before the Committee on Charitable Institutions, all that I asked for was for this preparatory school for children between five and ten years of age. These gentlemen were here, and they then opposed the plan. It was all we wanted then, and we shall be perfectly satisfied if we can now begin in that same humble way, teaching only these young deaf-mutes, and others who may wish to go there.

MR. BRANNING. I wish to ask Mr. Stone if I understand him to say that the age at which children are now sent to Hartford is as young as it is advisable to take them for the purpose of instruction?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir, if their instruction is to be limited to a period of seven or eight years ; if that is to complete their education.

Mr. SANBORN. If no other gentleman wishes to speak, I should like to present some papers which have been handed to me by several deaf-mute gentlemen. First, is a series of resolutions passed by the deaf-mutes of this city, at a meeting held last evening, which, as I understand, was quite fully attended, and the resolutions adopted unanimously :—

Resolved, That the early education of deaf-mute children is regarded by us as of great importance, and we would earnestly favor any plan by which these children could be taught as other children are in schools of their own neighborhood.

Resolved, That the asylum at Hartford cannot carry on and ought not to undertake the education of children at an age earlier than eight years ; and that the instruction of pupils in articulation at that asylum is not carried so far as, in our opinion, should be done.

Resolved, That in view of these and other considerations, we heartily support the recommendation of His Excellency Governor Bullock, in favor of the education of deaf-mute children within the limits of Massachusetts ; and would strongly urge upon the Legislature the adoption of a plan for that purpose.

Resolved, That it is a source of sorrow and mortification to the deaf-mutes of Massachusetts, to think that she makes a distinction between them and her more favored children, and sends them out of her borders, to be educated among strangers—merely because it is a little cheaper.

Resolved, That the views of the Board of State Charities, as set forth in their Reports, meet our approbation ; that we regard the members of that Board as our true friends, and the friends of the best method of deaf-mute instruction.

Resolved, That a copy of these Resolves be presented to the Legislature now in session.

Adopted unanimously.

Attest :

PHILO W. PACKARD, *Chairman*.

I am requested by Mr. Smith to hand these resolutions to you, and ask that you will bring them to the attention of the Legislature.

I have been requested by Mr. Carlin, whose paper I read at one of the two previous hearings in which the advocates of the education of deaf-mutes in Massachusetts have been heard, to read the following paper, in reply to some of the points which were brought out by Mr. Turner, I believe Mr. Day and Mr. Stevens. Mr. Carlin seems to have felt that, perhaps, his veracity was called in question, and he has made some defence of himself, and also made some statements which, I think, bear upon the question under discussion.

[Mr. Sanborn then read a portion of a letter, addressed to the Committee by Mr. Carlin, whose paper had been read at one of the previous hearings, in regard to which and to the discussion following it, Mr. C. desired to make some personal explanations.]

At this point, the Committee adjourned to meet in the afternoon, immediately after the adjournment of the House.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Committee met agreeably to adjournment, and Mr. SANBORN proceeded with his remarks. He said :—

I have first to present a paper from Mr. Smith. I would say, that in reading these papers, I would not be understood as sanctioning the language or sentiments, but only as presenting the ideas of the writers, which I think is due to them. This paper is a brief review of the question which has been discussed at these hearings. Mr. Smith, as you are aware, is one of the most active members of the deaf-mute organization in this city, and a graduate of the Hartford school.

Mr. Sanborn then read the paper of Mr. Smith, as follows :—

*Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee :—*I and my fellow-mutes have watched the progress of the hearing with the greatest interest, to see if we could find anything which would change our position at the opening of the hearing; but the very elaborate and cumbersome arguments from the other side, have convinced us more than ever of the necessity for legislative action in the matter as recommended by His Excellency the Governor.

Firstly, because *Hartford clings to, is wedded to the old system of instruction, and she needs to be convinced that that system is not the best—and she will not be convinced till Massachusetts has tried the new and better system.*

Secondly, because she treats articulation as of minor importance. *Until she was in danger of losing her beneficiaries, it was of no importance whatever!* While, perhaps, we would not attempt articulation in cases of congenital deafness, I repeat, it should be cultivated by all means in children made deaf by sickness, whose cases afford hope of success. It never has been zealously taught at Hartford, and never will be, because where there is no faith there can be no zeal.

Thirdly, because if the strong arm of the law were called into exercise it would be found that Massachusetts has two hundred deaf-mutes of suitable age for school, and that would crowd Hartford—and that number, even by the admission of Mr. Stone, is enough.

The census by no means gives correct returns. There are more mute children in Boston than the census gives credit for; this can be abundantly proved.

Fourthly, because it is not well to coop up children of both sexes in great numbers, in one large institution. Love laughs at stewards and matrons and superintendents, as well as at locksmiths.

Even if I did indorse the system in use at the American schools, I would never send a daughter to a large school like the Hartford Institution, where the two sexes intermingle.

This is a very important matter. Be the family oversight ever so strict, love will laugh, and laugh as heartily as you have been told by the other side that the scholars do with signs, in the articulation schools, when the teacher's back is turned—the graduates of this school know much more about this matter than the teachers.

Fifthly. Small schools, other things being equal are better than large ones.

Sixthly. A clear insight into this subject cannot be obtained by a few casual examinations and visits to the Asylum. *Every intelligent deaf-mute knows this.* No more can you tell one's real disposition or character after an acquaintance of an hour. It takes weeks and months. Those who have most carefully and impartially investigated the whole subject, and have made themselves fully acquainted with it, strongly urge the action proposed.

Seventhly and lastly. Massachusetts should have one or more schools for her deaf-mute children, as a matter of duty. It is not right to the children nor creditable to the State to send them abroad for an education; she should educate them at home, and as near their parents' door as is practicable, and they should commence as early as ordinary children. *I strike for early education.* Parents would not let their young children go too far from home and out of the State, therefore the necessity of providing for them near at home. I might go on and argue these positions at length, but, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not desire to take up the time of the Committee in any extended remarks. The points themselves I think will suffice.

I speak as a deaf-mute, at least I was admitted to Hartford and educated as such; palmed off and exhibited before Committees of the Massachusetts Legislature as such, many a time by my *Alma mater* in years gone by; but now all of a sudden disowned by her because my testimony is unfavorable to her. If I was then good evidence in favor of Hartford, why am I not good now on the other side?

I give her full credit for all the good she has done; no graduate of hers ever was more loyal than I; but she does not keep up with the march of improvement; her system is no longer the best; that is where I take exception. *She has not changed of her own free will for fifty years; what changes have been made have all been forced upon her, by fear of losing her pupils.*

That the system now in use and so cunningly upheld before you, intensifies the unfavorable effects of deafness, is very clear to my mind. "Seeing is believing." I would as soon doubt my own existence.

By association the deaf grow as it were more deaf, in their nature, and the dumb more dumb. This is a fact which cannot be gainsaid. The deaf-mutes in all large cities are unfortunately compelled to associate together, because their education unfits them to associate with others who cannot use signs.

Why thus oppose this movement? Why prolong the controversy about system? Why not say, "we don't believe in any other system but our own; we are willing that you should try what you think a better system?" But instead of doing this, the other side resorts to every expedient, and has done so for years, to prevent a full, fair and impartial trial by us.

We care not in what parts of the State you locate your schools; only let us have them in Massachusetts, and let us have an improved system of instruction.

My heart's desire is the still further improvement of my fellow mutes. I cannot think enough has been done for them. I don't believe enough will be done for them till Massachusetts takes them under her own charge. While yet yet uneducated, they are wards of the State.

I think the "insult" my friend Mr. Stevens speaks of, comes from quite a different way: We object to being made a special class.

That's where the insult lies. And this comes necessarily from the system pursued at Hartford. The Board of State Charities argue strongly against

this. They would treat us as ordinary men. Hartford would make of us a special class.

With all my love for old Hartford—my early school days there, how pleasant they are to look back upon—the good matron, the like of whom will never again be found, how I remember, love and esteem her,—I must yet say that Massachusetts ought to take her mute wards to her own bosom, and such is the sentiment of the whole deaf-mute community.

And we would beseech you, gentlemen, not to be induced by the plea of economy to put up longer with inferior wares, merely because they are cheaper. We beseech you to consider, not how you can have the cheapest instruction; but how you can get the best.

AMOS SMITH.

Mr. SANBORN continued as follows:—

Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to take up the time of the Committee. I do not know but that the whole subject has been so well presented by Dr. Howe, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Talbot, and those gentlemen and ladies who have spoken on the matter, that it is of no consequence for me to speak; but there are one or two points, I think, that have come up at a previous stage of these hearings, which may now need to be referred to, as the hearings have been somewhat protracted, in order that we may take our bearings exactly. We have heard a great deal of original matter and a great deal has been quoted. I hope the Committee will pardon me if I endeavor to show them how the question stands thus far, what the arguments have shown, and what they have not shown. This I will do very briefly.

I ought to say that, notwithstanding the many hearings that have been given on this subject, there are still a good many persons in this Commonwealth, within my own knowledge, who are interested in this matter, and who have information which they would like to present to the Committee, and which has not been presented. There have been several ladies here, who perhaps would feel diffident about appearing before the Committee, but who have information which I think ought to be presented. Mrs. Lamson, who instructed Laura Bridgman and Oliver Caswell, has attended the hearings, and has very important information to give concerning methods of instruction. A lady who was in attendance this morning, Miss Bond, has had under instruction a deaf and blind child, who has retained her articulation. The progress which this little girl has made is very interesting, and is important evidence in regard to the whole matter. Mr. George Walker, of Springfield, with whom many of the Committee are acquainted, the citizen of Massachusetts who has called the attention of the Board of State Charities to this matter of common school instruction, and who is acquainted with Dr. Blanchet, of Paris, is greatly interested in regard to this question, and would have appeared before the Committee the other day, when he was in Boston, had the hour of hearing been somewhat different.

There is great interest among a small number of people in this subject ; therefore I beg that the Committee will not imagine that the gentlemen who have appeared before them are the only persons who have this matter at heart. In saying this, I desire to correct, if possible, the impression left by Mr. Stevens, (if he left any such impression,) that Dr. Howe, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Hubbard and myself are the only persons interested in the matter. The Board of State Charities, as a Board, have recommended substantially the action which the Governor recommends. There is no disagreement of opinion among the members of the Board in regard to that. They may differ somewhat in regard to the question of articulation, but they do not differ at all respecting the policy of educating mutes in Massachusetts. There has not been, so far as I am aware, down to the present time, any difference of opinion among the members of the Board concerning this measure. It has always been regarded as one which, in time, must be adopted, and one which ought soon to be adopted. The Committee will pardon me for making these preliminary statements.

At the first of these protracted hearings, on the 24th of January, I had the pleasure of submitting three reasons for the action recommended by Governor Bullock in his annual address ; three reasons, either of them, in my judgment, sufficient to warrant the Legislature in providing for the education of deaf-mutes in Massachusetts ; and all of them capable of being strongly supported by facts and arguments. These reasons were :—

1st. That the children of Massachusetts ought to be educated in Massachusetts, particularly when educated by Massachusetts.

2d. That an establishment so large as that at Hartford is in some respects injurious to the best interests of the deaf-mute children educated there.

3d. That the instruction of deaf-mute children ought to begin earlier than it can possibly be carried on in establishments like that at Hartford, and therefore that Massachusetts ought to provide means nearer home for the early education of such children.

Now, Mr. Chairman, after listening to or reading the report of nearly all the speeches made by the three gentlemen from Hartford and one from Boston, who have occupied the time of the Committee during four hearings—namely, on the afternoon of January 31, and the forenoons of February 1, 6 and 7—I do not find that any argument has been made against the first or the third reason urged by me. Nobody has shown, or attempted to show, so far as I can find, that Massachusetts ought not to direct and control, through her own officers, the education of her own deaf-mute children. An effort has been made to show that Massachusetts can direct, to some extent, the education carried on at Hartford ;

but how little was really brought forward to support it! On the contrary, these hearings have developed the remarkable fact,—previously unknown to me, and, I presume, to most of my fellow-citizens,—that the asylum at Hartford, instead of being governed by gentlemen representing the original founders of the charity, is exclusively in the hands of citizens of Hartford. According to the statement of Mr. Day, this asylum, the only institution of its kind within the limits of New England—providing for the wants of more than 3,000,000 of people—is wholly in the hands of a close corporation of fifteen or twenty gentlemen, living in the city of Hartford. Hartford, with a population of 30,000, furnishes the officers who control half a million of money invested for the benefit of thousands of deaf-mutes, and practically direct the whole education of deaf-mutes in a population of 3,000,000. Talk about the representation of minorities after this, Mr. Chairman! Here is a minority of a hundredth part directing an interest which is a very important one for the other ninety-nine hundredths, who have no voice in the matter!

Now, Mr. Chairman, I maintain that Massachusetts cannot, through the self-elected Board of Directors, all living in the pleasant city of Hartford, exercise any control over her deaf and dumb children sent there to be instructed. I do not mean she cannot influence their education, but she cannot exercise what I call control. If the Directors, in their good pleasure, see fit to institute one mode of discipline, Massachusetts cannot gainsay it. Therefore, I reiterate, that the dignity of our State demands, and the best interests of these wards of the State require, that they should not be exiled to Connecticut, but retained as near their homes as is consistent with a good education. And let it not be supposed that anybody expects to teach all these children within a stone's throw of their present doors. Nobody has ever advocated that, but only that such as can be educated, while living at home, should have the opportunity.

As there has been no serious argument brought against my *first* position, so none has been offered against my *third*, namely, that in order to instruct deaf-mute children at an early age, it is necessary for the State to devise some new method within the State. All persons admit the importance of the early instruction, the only question being, how it shall be communicated. You heard the emphatic way in which that was stated this morning by Mr. Stone. It certainly cannot be given at Hartford, and just as certainly it can be given, to some extent, in this State. It cannot be given out of the State, for the reason that has been stated a dozen times in the course of these hearings, that parents will not send their children, under eight years of age, away from home, and especially to such a large institution as that at Hartford. In small schools, under the care of young women, such as teach in our common schools, a considerable number of the children, under eight years old, could be taught.

We might have such a school in this city, with, at least, twenty pupils, all of whom might live at home. In other parts of the State we might have other small schools, some of whose pupils might live at home. Several of the children in the school of Miss Rogers were received by her before they were eight years old—one of them under the age of seven.

MR. BRANNING. I understand that the recommendation of the Governor is that the deaf-mutes be immediately removed from Hartford; that is, he recommends that immediate measures be taken for the education of this class of persons in Massachusetts, without regard to the method of instruction. I do not understand the Governor to make any recommendation as to the method of instruction, whatever. His proposition is for the removal of the deaf-mutes; that is the matter submitted to us, and upon which we are acting, substantially, though we have opened a wide field in regard to the whole matter.

THE CHAIRMAN. I have forgotten if the Governor used the word "removal." I think he did not.

MR. DUDLEY. I did not understand Mr. Sanborn to say anything about methods at all. I do not understand him to be discussing articulation, or any method of teaching; but simply whether we had better make provision for instructing one class of deaf-mutes in Massachusetts.

MR. SANBORN. The use of the word "method" was simply with reference to a small school rather than a large one.

MR. BRANNING. After passing a warm eulogy on those who have overcome the greater difficulty of blindness superadded to privation of speech and hearing, the Governor says: "Assured as I am, on substantial grounds, that legislative action in this direction will develop rich sources of private beneficence, I have the honor to recommend that the initial steps be taken to provide for this class of dependants within our own Commonwealth." I think that covers the whole ground.

MR. SANBORN. I said that all persons admitted the importance of this early instruction. Perhaps I ought to except the gentleman who has just spoken. I mention the school of Miss Rogers because that is a school in actual existence, which in part corresponds with this idea. You all heard the emphatic manner in which Mr. Stone declared this morning that the authorities of the Hartford Institution, so far as he was authorized to speak for them, withdrew opposition to the establishment of an institution of this kind. I was very happy to hear that statement—it agreed with the gentleman's interest in this matter; and, if opposition from that quarter is withdrawn, there will be no opposition. All persons must come to the conclusion that the education of young children who have the misfortune to be deaf, should begin as early as

possible, and we know it is possible to begin, in many instances, earlier than is now done at Hartford.

Let me come back now to the second reason submitted by me for educating our deaf-mutes at home—that relating to the size of the institution in which they are taught. It is maintained by the Board of Charities, that all great aggregations of children in school, or of persons suffering under a common infirmity, ought to be avoided as far as possible. For this reason, we hold that the number of pupils at Hartford should be diminished. Mr. Turner has endeavored to show that we are wrong in this. He says that great collections of deaf-mute children are favorable to the development of certain branches of education—their manners, for instance; but I suppose he will not maintain that young ladies are obliged to take the fashion of their waterfalls from ladies who do not speak. I suppose that speaking ladies can just as well set the fashion in dress as deaf and dumb ladies. With regard to the sympathy manifested by one child for another, I admit that is an important point; but I think a school may come far short of two or three hundred scholars, and still the sympathy of one child with another be enjoyed to its fullest extent.

Against any fanciful benefit derived from great establishments, we set off certain great and positive disadvantages. In the first place, they tend to make the *deaf more deaf, and the dumb more dumb*. This seems absurd to Mr. Turner, but he will himself admit that there are many deaf persons who retain a portion of the sense of hearing, and many so-called dumb persons who retain some power of articulation. But this sense of hearing and this power of speech are apt to be lost in great establishments, where they are almost totally disused. This is the case, according to many witnesses, in the Imperial Institution at Paris, which furnished Hartford with its first teacher, and which is still one of the largest schools of this description in the world. An acute French physician many years ago called this establishment “*a good manufactory of deaf-mutes* ;” because, he said, “*whoever goes there as a pupil, partially deaf and partially mute, will come forth wholly deaf and totally mute.*” This, because the language of signs supersedes the use of the voice and the hearing, while these, through disuse, lose their power. This is a point which I state emphatically, and with regard to which I challenge contradiction. I would not go so far as to say that the use of the voice and the hearing is actually lost or diminished at Hartford, (though I believe that to be the fact,) but the testimony we have here, and all the other testimony anywhere, shows that this fact which I have stated is fully established; and the evidence read by Mr. Hubbard this morning goes to that extent.

In the second place the association of mutes in these establishments tends to separate them more completely from hearing and speaking people. There is the evidence of the deaf and dumb themselves, and it is supported by many facts. And as one consequence of this, they are much less likely to contract marriages among speaking persons, if they are educated both sexes together in a great establishment. You have heard what Mr. Smith and Mr. Carlin say on that point, and what they say is reasonable. But what are the consequences of such a marriage? As we learn from the pages of the Hartford report for 1861, they are a great increase of deaf-mute children, the offspring of such marriages. The statement is, that when both parents are deaf and dumb, the probability is very decidedly in favor of their having deaf-mute children, and the probability is very decidedly the other way, when one of the parents is a speaking person. The very interesting pamphlet written by an intelligent English gentleman, (Mr. Copleston,) which has been referred to here by Mr. Turner, states the case still more strongly. Mr. Copleston says: "The intermarriage of deaf-mutes—a most fruitful source of public pauperism, and an aggravation of their own misery—is promoted by their isolation from the world during the most susceptible period of their lives. Prof. Owen, at a meeting held at Willis's Rooms, in 1862, especially referred, as a physiologist, to the lamentable results of these intermarriages, and strongly advocated a social system of education."

I do not think we could have any higher authority than that. Sir Richard Owen is celebrated all over the world as a physiologist.

Mr. Copleston quotes also from Mr. Gladstone and others, in support of the ground which we take.

"Mr. Gladstone," he says, "in a lately-delivered speech, expressed his doubts 'as to the propriety of these institutions, on account of their tendency to bring the deaf and dumb too much or exclusively together,' and his doubts are not without good foundation. These institutions are aptly described as 'exile' schools, and their natural tendency is to annul 'the sacred ties of home,' and to abrogate social duties and social rights, affording, as they too frequently do, to callous parents and relatives the opportunity of evading the responsibilities of relationship, and thus frustrating the design of those laws which are intended to 'knit together the brotherhood of man.' The Rev. B. G. Johns, in his excellent work, 'The Land of Silence,' powerfully urges the impropriety of exclusively associating the deaf and dumb. 'If, indeed,' he says, 'they are to be considered as a degraded class, not fitted for intercourse with their more fortunate fellow-creatures, then their complete isolation by every possible means, and entire exclusion from general society, might be deemed an act of mercy. But common justice and common charity alike forbid this conclusion.' Mr. John Bird, M. R. C. S., has long labored to expose the danger of immuring the deaf and dumb and the blind in semi-monastic asylums, and still continues zealously to advocate 'a social treatment in place of exile and unintelligent pity.' In one

of his philanthropic appeals he says: '*The exiled deaf and dumb exert, in a far greater degree than is suspected, an unsocializing and, consequently, pauperizing influence on their families; whilst those who have enjoyed the blessing of social education and intercourse, are not only free from such evils, but, as the history of all the distinguished four-sensed peoples, gain a higher degree of education, and make those friends in the generous period of youth who, in after life, are ever ready to assist them to apply it.*'

"In reference to the pauperizing influence of exile schools, Hyppolite Van Landegheni, who had twelve years' experience in one of them, writes: 'If government would but order a return of all the deaf and dumb who, after leaving their temporary prisons, have found their way into workhouses, without doubt the generous benefactors who give so largely towards the support of exile institutions would be surprised and pained at the sight of so much pauperism in return for their cash.'

"One of the ablest instructors of the deaf and dumb Europe has produced—the late Dr. Watson, superintendent of the Old Kent Road Asylum at its foundation, 1792—gave it as his opinion that deaf-mutes should be isolated from five-sensed persons as little as possible, as tending to degrade them and render them more unhappy. The *City Press*, of Oct. 25, 1862, in a clever article on this subject, felicitously observes that '*all these charities do is to provide the inmates with food, raiment, shelter and monotony*,' and advises the subscribers to 'see if the expenditure on their behalf cannot be turned to better account.' We might continue to quote from a host of other authorities many facts and opinions quite as conclusive as the above, until the patience of the reader and our space were exhausted; but those we give, taken almost at random from works upon the subject, will no doubt suffice.

"The perusal of these statements must be painful to those who indiscriminately dispense their gifts; and we are forcibly reminded of the words of Dr. Chalmers, respecting the necessity of caution and judgment in the exercise of charity: 'When man, in his ignorance, though with well-intentioned benevolence, establishes any scheme or institution in opposition to the divine plan for the moral government of society, not only will he signally fail, but lay the foundation of aggravated mischief and suffering!'"

I mention these facts as showing that the position taken by the Board of State Charities is not a matter in which we stand alone; that some of the most enlightened physiologists and active philanthropists in England, as well as in this country, take the same position. I believe I have already stated, at a previous hearing, that the same thing is true of the efforts made in France by Blanchet.* His system of deaf-mute instruction has for its object and motive the restitution of the deaf-mute to society; and in the faith which he has in his method of operation, he is in entire unison with his celebrated predecessor, Dr. Itard, who complained all through his life of the injustice that was done to deaf-mutes by separating them from hearing and speaking persons, and by his will made pro-

* Since this speech was made, Dr. Blanchet has died, at the age of fifty.

vision for the instruction of a class of deaf and dumb in articulation. And even the Abbé Sicard, who was the finisher, so to speak, of what the Abbé de l'Epée began, after he had been engaged for more than twenty years in this business, printed an edition of his great manual of signs, called "The Theory of Signs," in which he made this very strong statement,—(I do not quote the exact language, but this is the substance of it,) that the only way of completely restoring the deaf-mute to society was by giving him the power of speaking and hearing. That is to say, he gave in his adhesion, at that late day, to the system of articulation which he had been opposing for twenty or thirty years.

I have now touched upon the three reasons which I brought forward at the first hearing, and which, although not the only reasons that might have been given for this proposed measure, were still, as I have said, in my opinion, sufficient to justify its adoption. But during the hearings, as the gentlemen of the Committee are painfully aware, the discussion has taken a very wide range, and has turned very much upon the method of articulation. I have always maintained, although I am, to some extent, a friend to the teaching of articulation, that this question can be decided without the slightest reference to the method of articulation, so far as there is any controversy about it. Everybody admits, I believe, that articulation, up to a certain point, is useful and even necessary. Mr. Turner and Mr. Stone are agreed that a certain number of pupils can and should be taught to articulate. We think that number is larger than they do. But with regard to the other class, the congenital deaf-mutes, although I have a very decided opinion in regard to teaching them articulation, I suppose we should let that question go. The main point of our argument is not affected a whit thereby: that the deaf-mutes of Massachusetts should be instructed in some way, and within the limits of Massachusetts. But there were one or two points in regard to articulation, that I noticed as the debate went on, with reference to which I would like to say a few words. I had the pleasure of quoting, at the first hearing, from a rare book which was not at that time in my possession, but of which I have since obtained a copy, showing that about the year 1780, a boy by the name of Charles Green, who was born in Boston, and either born deaf or lost his hearing before the age of six months, was taught to articulate by Mr. Braidwood, of Edinburgh, with such perfect success and in such a comparatively short period, that his father was perfectly delighted, and wrote an account of his education. He was so much interested in this subject, that a few years afterwards he published an elaborate work on the teaching of the deaf and dumb. At a time when there was but very little attention paid to this subject in this country or in Europe; before the establishment of the London Asylum, before the establishment of any State Asylum in France, and when there

was but one State asylum in the world—that established by the Elector of Saxony—this gentleman, Mr. Francis Green, of Boston, (I take pride in mentioning his name, because he was the first American, and almost the first Englishman, to take an interest in this subject,) prepared an elaborate plan for the education of deaf and dumb children. At this time, having taken the wrong side in the American Revolution, he was living in England. In 1797 he returned to this country, and died in Medford in the year 1809; and during that period of twelve years, he appears to have been unceasing in stirring up the people of Boston and Massachusetts to the importance of educating deaf-mute children, and educating them so as to speak. He never ceased to advocate the teaching of articulation to congenital deaf-mutes as well as others. He published articles in the *New England Palladium*, and prepared circulars which he sent to the clergymen of Massachusetts, requesting them to furnish him with the statistics of the deaf-mutes in their towns; and he obtained a considerable number of statistics as to the prevalence of deafness and dumbness at that period. There can be no controversy about this case of Charles Green. It is stated with such minuteness of detail and by a gentleman whose veracity never could have been impeached, that it must be regarded as an instance occurring within our bailiwick, the State of Massachusetts, of a boy born deaf, or what is its equivalent, who was taught to articulate with great distinctness.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks in regard to the pupils at Hartford who are in the same position, apparently, that Charles Green was.

Out of 103 pupils at Hartford from Massachusetts, whose condition at birth was recorded, and examined by me, 60 were set down as born with hearing, and 43 as born deaf. Of the 60 born with hearing, eight lost it at or before the age of six months. These, therefore, were to that extent of the same class with Charles Green; that is, they were either congenital mutes, or they lost their hearing before they reached the age of six months, which was his condition. Fourteen lost their hearing between the ages of six months and a year; twelve between the ages of one and two years; nine between two and three years; three between three and four years; six between four and six years; and four upwards of six years. The time at which the remaining four lost their hearing is not given. If it be true, as Mr. Turner has intimated, that all who lose their hearing before they are two years old are to all intents congenital deaf-mutes, then there were 77 of these 103 pupils whose chance for learning to articulate was as good as that of Charles Green. But if we allow that all who are born with hearing have a better chance than those born deaf, then only 60 appear to have had as good or a better chance to learn articulation, at the age of eight years, as he

had, provided they had been carefully taught; and no less than 22 of the 103, or more than one in five, lost their hearing after the age of two years, when they must have had a considerable power of articulate speech. That is to say, out of half the school, we find twice as many apparently capable of articulation, as Mr. Stone has mentioned in the whole school.

There may be a few mistakes in these figures, but I went over the catalogues very carefully, with Dr. Howe, and marked each pupil's name as I went along, and I think the mistakes cannot be very numerous. These are substantially the facts of the case, as they appear from the records at Hartford. There were only sixteen pupils whose names we examined concerning whom no record at all was made. The presumption is that they were divided in the same proportion. The inference that I would draw from these facts is the same that Mr. Hubbard so well drew this morning: that the number of persons capable of articulation, according to universal belief, is considerably greater than the gentlemen from Hartford have shown at these hearings.

Another point which I wished to bring forward was with regard to the capacity of the institution at Hartford to receive all the deaf-mutes of New England. A statement was made here by one gentleman, who is absent, so that I will not characterize his remark as I would if he were present, but a statement which showed very great want of familiarity with the facts on the subject. He said that the number of deaf-mutes is not materially increasing. I do not know what he would understand by "materially." Here are the figures taken from the United States Census. They show that there were in 1840, 6,682 deaf-mutes; in 1850, 9,085, (an increase of more than thirty-five per cent.); in 1860, 11,856, (an increase of more than thirty per cent.) The number reported in New England alone was, in 1850, 1,390; and in 1860, 1,477; but the compiler of the Census Report shows that there are great errors in the return, and that the true number in New England is at least 2,000, and in Massachusetts probably 800. I have on a former occasion assumed this number to be only 600 or 700, which I have no doubt is below the mark.

Nor is it true that the Hartford Asylum is large enough to receive all the deaf-mute children of New England who are of suitable age to be instructed. We have at present 110 there, out of a total of perhaps 750. In all New England there are three times as many, without counting those excluded on account of age and for other causes. If there are 330 in all New England, (my belief is that there are not less than 450,) then by withdrawing our 110 we should leave just about the number which the asylum contains at present, 220. If the other States

should send in their children as liberally as we have done, then the number at the Asylum would not be diminished at all.

The inference which I would draw from these figures is, that even if the Hartford Asylum is at the present time capable of receiving all the deaf-mutes of New England, which I deny to be the fact, yet five or ten years hence it will not be capable of receiving them, and therefore provision must be made sooner or later either for the enlargement of that institution, which we believe to be already too large, or for the establishment of new schools.

A number of questions were then put to Mr. Sanborn, and answered by him, with regard to several points which had come up during the hearings.¹ The opinion of the Abbé Carton with regard to the education of deaf-mutes in the common schools was again cited by Mr. Sanborn, who, in answer to a question by Mr. Turner, of Hartford, said the Board of Charities, like the Abbé Carton, did not believe that special schools for the instruction of deaf-mutes could be entirely superseded, but they believed they could be reduced in size, and that the pupils in them could be much more profitably instructed, if there was a good system of primary education.

This closed the public hearings, the Committee giving the right to both parties to hand in any written communications in reference to the subject that they wished to present afterwards.

The annexed papers were submitted afterwards.

The Committee subsequently visited the Asylum at Hartford and the school of Miss Rogers at Chelmsford.

I.

LETTER FROM JONATHAN WHIPPLE,

Describing his method of teaching Articulation and Lip Reading to the Deaf.

LEDYARD, CONN., Feb. 10, 1867.

MY DEAR KINSMAN:—Your welcome note of inquiry of the 2d was received last evening, and I hasten to answer it; and in doing so I will be so correct that you may depend on all I write you respecting the subject.

This deaf son Enoch was our fifth and youngest child; appeared to be as active and bright as any of our children at his age, but did nothing about trying to talk; yet it entered neither my own or my wife's heart that he was deaf; *never once* until we undertook to have him speak a word, (our children were all quite young when they commenced talking;) he then was about one year old. I had him in my lap. I spoke to him, but he took no notice of me; I spoke again and again, but he did not even turn to look at me, (his face being from me;) finally, I raised my voice to *quite a high key*, and withal gave his cheek a little brush with a comb I had in my hand. At that, he started almost with a bound, and whirled about and looked at me. I then spoke to my wife, who sat in the corner, on the other side of the fire-place, and said, "This little boy is deaf." Said she, "No, no more than you are." I said, "I will get his face from you, and then you try him." I did so, and then she spoke, "Enoch," but he took no notice. Said I, "Keep speaking until you make him hear, if you can," and so she continued on, and I telling her, "Raise your voice until you make him hear, if you can," and she did so, but had to raise her voice almost to the highest key before he heard, and when he heard a noise, he knew nothing which way it came from, but whirled this way and that. I then spoke, "There, you see he is deaf, don't you?" Said she, "He surely is." Well, after this, we knew we had a little deaf son, and so deaf that he would never learn to talk, unless there was some extra effort, some way. We found that he would not try to do a *thing* towards speaking, unless he was looking you *right in the face*, and then he would try to imitate you. Instead of ever doing anything in the line of *motioning* out any word, or letter, or thing, we would be very particular in *speaking very plain*, and be sure his face was towards us. And by thus doing we found he *could* learn and *did* learn. He was not quite as forward in learning to talk

as our other children were ; but he is an intelligent talker, a very good reader, a good speller, and quite good in figures ; and does nothing by motioning any more than you would. And if Enoch should now happen to come into your house, and you knew nothing who he was, and should commence talking, you would have no mistrust that he was deaf at all, unless your mouth was covered with beard ; that would betray his condition, as he could not have a chance to see the operation of the mouth and lips. Some people, you know, will have a quid of tobacco in their mouth, and that sometimes makes it difficult for him to understand ; and again a person that talks very quick, sometimes he will have to ask a second time ; and still another class who use their mouths and lips so very little that you can hardly see them move *any*, such persons it bothers him sometimes to understand. But any and every person, who speaks in a plain, intelligent manner, he understands just as readily as a person who hears well. I have noticed that many times when he and I have been sitting in our wagon together, as we were passing about from place to place in our butchering business, being in quite a hurry, a man would call out to us, and would want to know when we could butcher for him, &c., and I should not hear, and as I commenced to ask what he said, Enoch would answer the man's inquiry, and out with our book to see when we could do his work. After my eyesight got poor, he carried our time-book. I have often said to Enoch, " You did not hear that man did you ? " " Why, no, I saw his mouth." Now, I don't want you to understand that he hears nothing ; but I do want you to understand that he can understand a good plain-spoken person, if he hears *not a breath of noise*.

As I have mentioned in some of my letters to you, that I never had the opportunity of going to school one day as a scholar, yet I tried teaching a few terms, and that happened when Enoch was a child. But I sent him to school when I did not teach, but he used to say that he could hear *not a word*, only when the teacher screamed as loud as he could. He would say, " Father, the school-room is as still as the graveyard to me." But when I did not teach the school, I would attend to his case at home ; and would encourage him and keep him along with his class. People that have had no experience in this line, never have thought upon the subject. Now, all of us who think at all, know that every person who speak the letters A, B, C, or any other letter *plain*, has to have the *same* operation with the mouth and lips, and so it is in speaking the name of anything, or persons' names, &c. After having my experience with this son of mine, I begin to think that any person, however deaf he might be, could be taught to talk. And there happened to be a mute whose father lived in my neighborhood, and the mute was at Hartford to the Dumb Asylum. I was well acquainted

with him before he went, for he was often to my house. After he got through with his learning and came home, he soon came to my house to see us. I very soon took a slate and on it wrote, "Did you ever speak a word?" He took the slate and answered, "No, I can hear none." I again wrote, "I think that I can teach you to speak." He again took the slate and wrote, "No, I can hear none at all." But I again wrote, "Notwithstanding that, I think that I can teach you to speak." He looked again, but instead of writing, in answer to that, he turned away with seeming disgust, having his face all scowled up, and his hands raised as if he felt imposed upon. But I did not give it up then. There being a pail of water standing by, (we were in the blacksmith's shop,) I wrote *water*, that being an easy word for the learner to understand, and showed him the word, and pointed at the water. He at once manifested that he understood that, and I expected that he did. But then I mouthed the word *water* out, and motioned for him to try it, but he declined; but I did it again, insisting for him to try it, and would not take no trial for an answer. But after much solicitation, and showing him the operation of my mouth in speaking the word *water*, he made an effort, but being so embarrassed, and not knowing anything as to the pitch of the voice, the first time he rather squeaked it out, but spoke *water* understandably. I then manifested that he had done *well*, but wished him to nerve up, (acting it out myself,) and speak out loud, and the second time he spoke it out loud and very plain. I then tried him on the word *butter*, that being an easy word for the learner. He appeared willing to make a trial on that at once, and spoke it out loud and plain, so much that all in the shop laughed right out, and said, "he spoke well," and the mute was so pleased himself, that he laughed among the others and then took a turn about the shop; then coming up to me again, took the slate and wrote, "Teach me to say bread." I then mouthed out "bread," knowing of course that in speaking "bread," he would not sound the *r*, but he tried that at once, speaking loud and prompt, but spoke the word as I expected, *bed*; but I wrote *good*, knowing that it would take time to teach him the sound of the *r*. There were growing under the shop window water-melons, and knowing that melon was an easy word, I then tried him with that, pointing at them, and he spoke out melon good and plain. This was all done as quick as I could tell over the story. I tried him no more, and I have seen him but very few times since.

The experience I had had with Enoch, and then this little trial with this mute, led me to the belief that any young, intellectual, smart, deaf child could be taught to talk, only take them in season, and attend to it with patience and perseverance, and having the *art* of teaching the deaf

to talk. Having this belief, and the experience I had had, I would speak of it in this way wherever I happened to be.

Some eighteen years since, there came to me a deaf boy, so deaf that he had not learned to talk, though he could hear as well or better than Enoch. This boy could partly speak a few names of the members of their family. He had a brother Orlando, and he, in trying to speak this name, would say, "Lano, Lano," and one or two others in like manner. I kept the boy a few weeks,—I forget just how long—but I succeeded in teaching him to call off the whole alphabet in a plain manner, and to spell quite a good many words, and to speak them plain. But as his mother was a poor widow, and being not in a situation to spend my time without being paid, and as she could send him to the Dumb Asylum at Hartford free, she did so. But he still will say quite a number of words, but don't depend on talking as Enoch does.

Then, again, in the fall or winter of 1864, among our calls to butcher, some men from the west side of New London River called upon us, and one of them had two deaf children, one of whom could talk none, but the other, being older, had learned to talk before her deafness came upon her, (it being brought upon both by scarlet fever.) The son being about where we were catching a hog, I called to him, telling him where to stand. The father said, "My son is deaf." Said I, "That is the case with my son." There was no more said about it until we got the hog, and were skinning it. The father then came and said to me, "How deaf is your son?" Said I, "So deaf that he hears nothing we say now." "But," said he, "he appears to talk." Said I, "Oh, yes, he can talk as well as any of us." "How long has he been deaf?" Said I, "From his infancy." And he continued on with his talk until we finished his hog, which was perhaps twenty or thirty minutes. We then left for other places, and thought nor heard any more from this man until the 4th day of December, 1865. He then came to my house and brought this deaf son, wishing me to make a trial upon him. I told him, if he expected that I could teach him at all, he need not expect that it could be done at once. It would take years. Said he, "Are you willing to try him two weeks, and see if you can do anything with him?" I concluded to try him, and I kept him one hundred days, and in that time I taught him the alphabet perfect; taught him to speak and spell very many words, such as house, barn, shed, shop, road, wall, tree, land, rock, stone, horse, cow, river, brook, head, eye, nose, mouth, teeth, tongue, &c., &c. He could speak them all in a plain manner and spell them right. I got him so started, that his father thought that by following my directions they could bring about something with him themselves, as he had not means to spare. I have not heard a word from him since he left. He was too old—was twenty-one while with

me. In order to have children learn well, they need to be commenced with before they have their heads filled with everything but what they need. I have thought abundantly upon the subject of teaching the deaf to talk, and it is my candid judgment, (if I have any,) that the time is not far distant when there will be hardly a child but what will talk, whether they hear or not, if they are only intellectual, and are not lacking in any of the organs of speech. Just think of it! Here is a nice, smart, intellectual child, having every facility for talking the *first-rate*, but does not talk, and why? Because he cannot hear. This is the only reason, for he has good sound lungs, a good, well-shaped mouth, tongue, teeth, palate, and every facility for talking, but cannot hear; he can laugh and cry, and make the same noise in doing it that the hearing child does. Why happened this? Because this comes natural—it is spontaneous, it comes of itself. Not so with speech—this noise has to be shaped, gauged and so fixed and manufactured as when it presents itself it is language, and can be understood. Now, this deaf child lacks nothing but the *knowledge* of putting his talking machine in operation. And as every *good, plain* talker's machine undergoes just the same operation, I would ask is there no person in the land that has ingenuity and acuteness enough to assist this deaf child in putting his machine in motion aright? I am ready to say or answer in the affirmative. I think it can and will be done. There are more of the mutes who hear *some* than we are apt to think, yet they hear not enough so as to learn to talk, &c., like other children who have the advantage of hearing. In the course of my seventy-two years' stay here on earth, I have tried, I suppose, between fifty and one hundred mutes, to see if I could make them hear any, and I don't think there has been over five but what I could make hear some. The first person here spoken of, after my son, his parents never even thought of his being a subject for a mute, and appeared not to think that he was deaf *any* until I told them. I happened to be at work for the old man, putting in a new fire-place, before stoves were in use. And I should think that deaf boy was eight or nine years old; he was large enough to draw water at the well and bring in a pailful. He appeared to be about there, but said nothing, (this was before Enoch was born.) I noticed that he was not a common child, though he appeared not foolish, yet he said *not a word*. I kept noticing him, and now and then would speak to him, and call him by name, but he did not speak. Every now and then his mother would go to the water pail, and take hold of it, and commence rattling it about, stamping about, and calling and telling him to bring water. I noticed that the boy would take no notice of her until she stamped smart enough to jar the floor so that he felt it, then he would look around, and then by her shaking the pail he would run off

very actively and get water. I finally spoke to the old folks, and said, "Your little boy is deaf, is he not?" "Oh, no, he is not deaf, he is heedless," said they. But I proved it all out to them. I could make him hear a sharp whistle that I could make with my finger in my mouth, but he could not hear enough to learn to talk by hearing, and so he grew up a mute. At that time, I knew nothing about learning to talk by sight, as Enoch did. Such a manner of talking never once entered my heart, until I was providentially brought to the trial, and then even it came on in such a way I hardly comprehended. My venerable father would often speak while I was laboring with my little boy in trying to teach him to talk. He would say, "Jonathan, if you was not a remarkable man, your little Enoch would have been a mute, he never would have learned to talk in the world." And since seeing a number that were mutes, who could hear as well as he, I know that if there had been no extra pains taken, he would have been one.

Well, I have filled my sheet, and if it contains anything that will benefit anybody, I shall be glad. And now if you wish to ask me any more questions, write any time, and as much as you wish. If I know anything that others don't that will benefit the great family, I want others to know it. I am poor, no money to give away, and fear whether I have anything but love. I am pretty sure that I love every son and daughter of Adam. (Signed,) JONATHAN WHIPPLE.

CHARLES K. WHIPPLE.

P. S. MONDAY MORNING, 11th.

As I have not the opportunity of sending to the post-office just this moment, it being three miles from me, I thought I would add a little to the letter. The last deaf person I had with me, notwithstanding he could hear some, I could not do a *thing* with him by putting my mouth to his ear and trying to make him understand by *hearing*. He would push my face away and say, "See mouth," (after he had learned these words.) I got him so well disciplined in the one hundred days he was with me, that I could sit before him and commence anywhere in the alphabet I pleased, and skip about in *any* direction, and *every* direction, and make not a breath of noise, and call over the letters as fast as I might, and he would call every letter perfectly plain, and as fast as I did. There are some letters and some words that are formed *within* the mouth, and such are much more difficult to teach; but the great difficulty is not in speaking *words*, but in learning the sound of the letters *perfect*. I must stop, as I have a chance to send my letter.

EXTRACT FROM ANOTHER LETTER BY MR. WHIPPLE.

I have said that there ought to be no motioning, if you want to learn a deaf person to talk. What I intended to convey was, *never* in a sin-

gle instance have motioning crowd language away, and take the lead; but *language* be your teacher in every case, and have the child so understand it, and in no case have that crowded out of its place. Since I last wrote you in answer to your inquiries, I have had quite a talk with Enoch upon this subject, and he was telling me of some circumstances that may not be uninteresting to you, which I will mention. He said, "There is one man in particular, a machinist, who works at Mystic; every single time I happen into the shop, just as soon as he gets his eye upon me, if I am near enough so he thinks I can make him hear, he will commence talking to me. I was there a few days ago, and he commenced, and the machinery made such a noise, I had to hollow as loud as I could to make him hear; but he kept talking, and finally said, 'How is it *possible* for you to understand as you do and not hear?'" Said Enoch, "I will try to illustrate some to you if I can. How is it that you understand when people call over different names, and tell different stories?" "Why, by *hearing* them of course." "Well, you understand then by there being differences in the *sound* of the *names* of different articles and things, do you?" "Why, yes; if everything sounded alike, of course I should not know the name of one thing from another." "Well, it is just so with me; only with me it is *seeing*, and with you it is *hearing*. If every letter and word and thing looked alike, I should not know one thing from another. Now to me there seems as much difference in the looks of the different words as in the shape of the letters; but I must *see* them as they fall from the speaker's lips, and each word fairly shaped."

II.

LETTER FROM DR. H. P. PEET.

INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB, }
 NEW YORK, Feb. 16, 1867. }

GARDINER G. HUBBARD, Esq., *Boston*.

DEAR SIR :—Your letter of the 14th instant was received by to-day's mail, in which you say: "The experience I have had with my little girl leads me to hope for better results from the education of semi-mutes than you anticipate from the experience derived from your method of instruction."

From the above quotation, I fear you have misapprehended me. I have never entertained a doubt that articulation could be taught to those children who lost their hearing so late in life that they retained a knowledge of articulate sounds. There are fifteen or twenty per cent.

of such cases in our institution, and their speech does not deteriorate, but actually improves, by the attention which they receive. But to be the most successful, they must receive individual instruction. The attention which your little girl can receive in the family, can hardly fail to develop satisfactory results. You do not speak of the improvement which she has made in the acquisition of alphabetic language. We do not use the language of signs as an end, but as a means to enable our pupils to acquire a knowledge of connected discourse. By the plan adopted in your teaching your little girl, discarding signs, she must learn language by usage, which must be much more limited as a means of narrating facts, than when you employ signs, which are applicable to every department of human knowledge, and hence it seems to me that mental development must be much more rapid than where words are used to explain other words. In the case of a semi-mute, I should use vocal speech, the manual alphabet, signs and writing. It is hardly worth while, therefore, for me to be more specific in order to be understood, in addition to what I have already stated in a former letter.

Very respectfully and truly yours,

(Signed,)

H. P. PEET.

III.

LETTER FROM MRS. M. A. LIPPITT.

PROVIDENCE, February 27, 1867.

MY DEAR MISS ROGERS:—I supposed that by this time your expected visit would have been made, and have been expecting every day to hear the result; still I cannot but think they will finally decide to give this thing a fair trial. The more that I see of speaking in place of signs, the more I am convinced that it is the best mode for all.

Jeannie* lost her hearing at the age of four years and three months, from the effects of scarlet fever. The loss was instantaneous and entire, hearing when she fell asleep, and never having heard a sound since she awoke. She was five years old when I first commenced teaching her the letters of the alphabet, none of which had ever been taught her. She had lost all knowledge of forming sentences, although she remembered the names of some things; for instance, she remembered the name of a key, and also of the pronoun "you," and by showing her a key, and pointing to herself, (you,) we obtained the sound of "q," which we had tried ineffectually to get for weeks, and also the sound of "k;"

* Miss Jeanie Lippitt of Providence.

these consonants being the most difficult and the last that she learned. We used no means except articulation from the commencement, being particularly directed in this by Dr. Howe. Although now speaking well and pleasantly, she improves in distinctness and fluency, as we observe ourselves, and as our friends remark to us, who meet her occasionally. Her studies at present are arithmetic, English history, geography, grammar, composition, physiology and reading. The last I mention because it is a study in articulation, and of great importance to her. We allow for that study one hour each day. In arithmetic, she has passed through, understandingly, Simple Proportion of Greenleaf's, and has commenced Compound. In grammar, she is parsing in Paradise Lost. In composition, her standing is fair. She has just commenced Goodrich's History of England; has studied the history of the United States. These studies she has pursued alone with her teacher, reciting verbally, of course. The study of physiology she has recently commenced at a private school, (which she has attended for some time for drawing, writing and gymnastic exercises,) in a class of twenty girls, many older than herself, and is doing *well*, understands the teacher's explanations, answers any questions put to her, and is able to read upon the lips of the young ladies a good part of their recitations.

Perhaps you would like to know that she is able to make herself a great favorite with her companions, being sought constantly, and we are obliged to decline all invitations for her for any days except Friday evenings and Saturday, on account of her studies, and that with all these young people with whom she associates, she communicates *only with* the lips. If any account of Jeannie can induce any one to attempt this very much improved mode of teaching deaf persons, in preference to the old system, I will at all times be most happy to furnish any facts.

Most sincerely and with much love,

I am ever yours,

(Signed,)

M. A. LIPPITT.

IV.

LETTER FROM MRS. HORACE MANN.

CAMBRIDGE, February 28, 1867.

MR. SANBORN:—*Dear Sir*,—I have been looking over some old letters to my sister to see if it was to her that I had written fully, when in Europe, of my visits to the deaf-mutes schools. I see that it was not.

In regard to this subject I have followed up the proceedings with very great interest. Dr. Howe sent me his pamphlet, by which I saw

that the old fires in him were still ready to sparkle and blaze up at the right touch. I was thankful that the subject was revived, and hope it will not die down again till the right thing has been done. Nothing that I saw abroad interested me so much as those schools. I believe I made myself quite a nuisance on my return, in endeavoring to impress people with them; but sometimes, after talking a long while, I would find that people had not received the first idea of actual articulated speech. I would rather have done that thing, than to have worked miracles, in the common acceptance of that word. All that it implies of patient well-doing is equalled only by the teaching of the idiots, which, I confess to be the greatest of human achievements; but I only read of that,—the other I saw and heard. The reading of poetry in the Berlin school was the greatest performance of all, because it was done even with the elocutionary accent. I could not rest till I had inquired of the teachers how that was done. One invaluable feature of these schools was, the use made of the eyesight. The cabinets were museums of everything that could be shown. I mean everything useful; they did not contain what we call curiosities,—but every possible implement, models of the same, if the articles themselves were too large, sections of different woods, with a leaf and seed of the tree and often a dried flower. These were put into the pupils' hands, and then they were told their uses, taught all their names, how used in the arts, or for food, or buildings, &c. Machines were taken apart and put together and explained, so that the vocabularies learned had an article in hand for every word. It was comparatively easy, then, to teach abstract words; but it was all done with the lips, for signs were prohibited. Doubtless they sometimes used them among themselves, but I saw none, and they were forbidden in the schools. Little children looked each other in the face and talked. You may imagine how eyes learned to look and how expressive they were too. One felt that the souls were in full communion, and that there need be no limit to this,—not half as much sequestration as deaf persons suffer to whom people are weary of screaming, or who live with a tube in their hands. It is no more exertion to talk to one of those deaf-mutes, so instructed, than to any one else. They could understand me, though I spoke German but indifferently well. Of course they lose all which voice and tones convey, and this is a great loss; but their desire to learn to speak, after it has once brought its fruits, insures all the intense attention which alone makes it possible to the teacher; and when they want to know any particular thing, they look as if their souls were a blazing torch within them. I wanted to stay with them longer and watch all their lessons. If vacations had not interfered, (for it was the summer season,) we should have seen much more of it, and possessed ourselves still more fully with it. I have Mr.

Hill's book, who was, I think, the most successful and the most distinguished of all the teachers.

After I returned to this country I described this instruction to one friend, whose child had lost his hearing by scarlet fever and was evidently growing dumb in consequence. The parents immediately attended to it, and the child, who was then very young, was saved in speech, though not wholly in hearing. It was our friend T. W.

Yours, with regard,

(Signed,)

MARY MANN.

V.

LETTER FROM REV. WM. HARLOW,

A D E A F C L E R G Y M A N .

BROOKLYN, N. Y., March 14, 1867.

F. B. SANBORN, Esq. :—*Dear Sir*,—Yours of the 4th inst., has just been received, in which you state that you would inquire whether it is true that I can “by watching the lips and expression of a preacher, understand mainly what he says. Can you, for example, without hearing a word of it, repeat the text and give the substance of the discourse?”

This is true in many, but not in all cases. It is true that my deficiency of hearing has quickened my faculties of sight, as blind people are often known to have a keener sense of hearing than those who are not blind.

I suppose that practice and experience, are often the best schools in which these faculties can be cultivated and improved, though very much depends on the taste, capacity and disposition of an individual in the acquisition of knowledge.

In regard to the extent of my deafness, I would state that I cannot, by the voice, understand common conversation. I can read when others are conversing, with little or no disturbance from them. I seldom hear the words of public speakers, so as to be able to understand their meaning, though I often hear the sound of the voice, especially when it is unusually elevated.

In order to “read on the lips of an individual,” it is necessary that he should speak plainly, deliberately, distinctly, and show an expressive face. Those who wear a full beard, raise their voices to a loud tone, speak with great rapidity, so as to run their words together, are very verbose, with long sentences, show little or no movement of the lips, or keep their teeth closed together, are seldom or never understood at all.

I am a member of Rev. Dr. Cuyler's church in this city. I find no difficulty in following him in all the public services. The sermons are generally as familiar as though I had read them. There are many other clergymen whom I can understand with equal facility, but it requires my undivided attention. The power to do this does not seem very remarkable to me, though as you say, "it has been called in question by many persons."

If I have not been as particular as you could desire, in this statement, and you should wish to make any further inquiries, I shall be most happy to aid you in your laudable endeavors for the benefit of the unfortunate. Any communications from you, directed to me, No. 107 South Oxford Street, Brooklyn, New York, will be duly received and acknowledged.

Truly yours,

(Signed,) WILLIAM HARLOW.

VI.

LETTER FROM PROF. EDWARDS A. PARK.

GARDINER G. HUBBARD, Esq.:—*Dear Sir*,—In compliance with your request, I write the following statements:

On the 12th of November, 1863, I visited the Institution for the instruction of deaf-mutes at Brunswick, Germany. The instructor, Stahl, is decidedly in favor of teaching the deaf-mutes to *speak* rather than to use the finger-signs. He thinks that the process of teaching them to speak conduces far more to the *intellectual* and also to the *moral* and *religious* improvement of the deaf-mutes than the other method does. His pupils are not allowed to use the finger-signs at all. They understand *him* very easily when he speaks to them; they write with remarkable correctness, and they speak so that he can easily understand them, although their pronunciation is monotonous and unpleasant. I never saw deaf-mutes so happy as these pupils are.

On the 16th of March, 1864, I visited the Institute at Homberg in Hesse Cassel. The deaf-mutes here were about twelve years of age, and were from the lower classes of society. They did not seem to be naturally very intelligent. They spoke, however, quite distinctly; I could easily understand them. They did not appear to be so happy as the Brunswick pupils. The teacher remarked to me that, "after merely *four* or *five* years of instruction, the scholars are apt, through indolence, to neglect the practice of speaking; but after *seven* or *eight* years of instruction the scholars will be ready to mingle with the family circle, and to understand nearly as much of the conversation as if they could hear

it. Strangers, however, will not understand the language of the deaf-mute so well as those familiar with him, as they will not understand the babbling of a child when the child's mother will comprehend it easily." The teacher at Homberg, as at Brunswick, is fully convinced that the *intellect* of the deaf-mute is far more effectually roused by teaching him to speak, than by any other process. The "*oral language*" he says, "is a far better means of moral discipline than the *hand-language*."

On the third of June, 1864, I spent some time at a deaf and dumb asylum at Berlin. I could not understand the pupils here so easily as in the other schools. It seemed evident, however, that while the pupils in Berlin were *inclined* to use the hand-language because it was easier to them, they would yet derive a more *permanent* pleasure from the oral language.

Every new word seemed like a new conquest. It seemed evident that the mode of teaching by words required more patience than the other method, and was better fitted for the Germans with *their* language, than for the Americans with *our* language.

There was at Berlin a great difference between the pupils; *some* of them speaking *worse* than in any other school which I have visited; while *one* of them, who had spent six years in the school, spoke as distinctly as the majority of boys who are not deaf-mutes. Two or three others spoke so that I could easily understand them.

On the whole my impressions in regard to teaching the deaf-mutes to speak were favorable. I visited these schools with *great* doubt, and left them with *much less* doubt in relation to this method of giving instruction. I saw several persons who had been educated in these schools and who had become active and useful as mechanics. One of them was enthusiastic in his expressions of thankfulness for having learned the oral language.

I am sorry that I cannot say more to the purpose in this letter, but my memory does not warrant me in going beyond these statements.

With high regard, I am, dear sir,

Your friend and servant,

EDWARDS A. PARK.

ANDOVER, March 22, 1867.

VII.

LETTER FROM MR. TALBOT.—(CORRECTION.)

[See page 204.]

FEBRUARY 25, 1867.

Hon. FRANK B. FAY :—*Dear Sir*,—At the last hearing before the Committee on the Education of the Deaf and Dumb, the question was put to me, Whether, at the school at Chelmsford, signs were used by the children there in attendance?

I answered that I knew that communications by signs were forbidden at all times, and that it was my opinion that no signs were used under any circumstances.

On Saturday last I visited the school at Chelmsford, and noticed particularly this point, and am now satisfied that the facts will not sustain the opinion then given by me.

The children do communicate among themselves, more or less, by signs of their own; but they are not taught any signs, nor do the teachers understand the sign language.

I am led to make this communication, as I wish to stand exactly right on this question. Yours truly, THOS. TALBOT.

VIII.

ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF AMERICAN ASYLUM.

[Prepared by request.]

The American Asylum, at Hartford, is the oldest school for the education of the deaf and dumb in the United States. Public attention was first directed to it by the presence of a deaf-mute little girl in the family of Dr. Cogswell, an eminent physician of that city. It was soon found that there were other deaf-mutes in this country, and it was decided to send some one abroad, to acquire the art of educating them, and to establish a school for this purpose. Funds were raised, and the Rev. Thomas H. Gallaudet, D. D., was selected for this work. He left the United States May 15, 1816, to execute the mission intrusted to him. The institution was incorporated by the Connecticut legislature in May, 1816, under the name of "The Connecticut Asylum for the Education and Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb." Mr. Gallaudet returned to this country August 22d of the same year, accompanied by Mr. Laurent Clerc, a deaf-mute pupil of the Abbé Sicard. They immediately commenced collecting funds to start the school. The enterprise excited general interest, and individuals and churches con-

tributed liberally. The sum of twelve thousand dollars was raised in the course of a few months, five thousand six hundred dollars being obtained in Massachusetts, over two thousand dollars of which was collected in the city of Boston.

In 1819, the legislature of Massachusetts made provision for the support of twenty pupils at the asylum. In the same year, Congress gave the directors a township of land, which was judiciously located and sold, realizing about three hundred and fourteen thousand dollars, of which seventy-five thousand dollars was invested in real estate, and the balance in productive funds. In consequence of this grant, desiring to make the institution as widely useful as possible, the directors applied for a modification in the corporate name of the asylum, and it was accordingly changed to "The American Asylum." Three reasons were given for wishing this change: 1st, that the design of the institution was, to relieve this misfortune, wherever found; 2d, the generous contributions of individuals to its funds; and, 3d, the liberal grant of the government. On coming into possession of the fund, as above mentioned, the directors adopted two principles for its management, viz.: 1st, that they would spend all the income accruing from it in the work of deaf-mute education, and not allow the fund to accumulate; 2d, that they would expend *only* the income, and thus preserve the principal as a sacred trust, for the benefit of the deaf and dumb, for all time. The terms of the grant were free and unqualified. On the above principles, the fund has been carefully and gratuitously managed, without loss, to the present time. In January, 1825, commissioners from Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Massachusetts met at the asylum, to consider the question, whether each of these States should establish separate schools for the education of deaf-mutes, or should send their pupils to Hartford. The commissioners voted unanimously to adopt the latter course. Rhode Island came into the arrangement in 1842.

IX.

DEAF-MUTES IN MASSACHUSETTS.

A list of Deaf-Mutes in Boston and vicinity, collected by Mr. Amos Smith, shows that there are in Boston, 90; Charlestown, 16; Cambridge, 14; Roxbury, Salem, Randolph and Weymouth, 8 each; Medford, 5; Natick, Somerville, Winchester and Reading, 4 each; Chelsea, South Braintree, Canton, 3 each; Danvers, Stoneham, Bedford, Easton, Marblehead, Milton, Dorchester, 2 each; Brookline, Bridgewater, Dedham, Lynn, Lynnfield, Malden, Melrose, Stoughton, 1 each. Estimated number in State—700.

